



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-215
Tuesday
6 November 1990

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-215

CONTENTS

6 November 1990

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Commentator Warns Against Arms Transfers to South [Ovchinnikov in PRAVDA 2 Nov] 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gorbachev-Baker Meeting Possibility Examined [Moscow Radio] 2
 Gorbachev, Shevardnadze Meet New Ambassadors [TASS] 2
 Film on Wallenberg Opens in Moscow [TASS] 2

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Meets ROK Business Leader in Moscow [TASS] 4
 Possible Meeting Between Korean Leaders Viewed [IZVESTIYA 23 Oct] 4
 Prospects for Cooperation in Northeast Asia Noted [Moscow International] 4
 Popov Interviewed on Japan, Taiwan Deals [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Nov] 4
 Mongolian Press Criticizes Soviet Legacy [Moscow TV] 6

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Prospects for Cambodian Peace Assessed [Moscow International] 6
 ASEAN Economic Ministers Conference Viewed [Moscow International] 7

Near East & South Asia

Primakov Views Talks With Iraq's Saddam [Moscow TV] 8
 Reports View, Assess Baker's Mideast Tour 8
 Purpose Examined [Moscow International] 8
 Solutions Considered [TASS] 9
 Palestinian Leader Urges Peaceful Solution in Gulf [IZVESTIYA 5 Nov] 9
 Commentaries Assess Persian Gulf Conflict 9
 Soviet Role Viewed [LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA No 41] 9
 War Seen as Inevitable [PRAVDA 5 Nov] 14
 Poll Notes Public Opinion on Gulf Events [IZVESTIYA 29 Oct] 14

Sub-Saharan Africa

TASS Previews Angolan Peace Talks in Lisbon 15
 Complications Seen in Ethiopia, Sudan Relief [Moscow International] 15
 Problems Follow Cease-Fire in Rwanda 16
 Situation Compared to Liberia [Moscow International] 16
 Refugee Problem Remains [Leontyev on Moscow International] 16
 Reports View, Assess Somali Government's Crisis 16
 Opposition Poses 'Threat' [Moscow International] 16
 Envoy Notes Reconciliation Efforts [Moscow International] 17
 Kompletkov Receives Namibian Envoy's Letter [TASS] 18

East Europe

Moscow To Supply Oil, Pay Off Debts to Yugoslavia [Belgrade TANJUG]	18
Problems Continue With Troops Leaving Hungary [Moscow TV]	18
Polish Prime Minister Favors Developing Relations [TASS]	18
Economic Accord With Czechoslovakia Proposed [Prague HOSPODARSKE NOVINY 26 Oct]	19
Border Conflict, 'Customs War' With Poland Viewed [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 20 Oct]	20

West Europe

Up to 30 KGB Agents Said Operating in Netherlands [AFP]	23
Deputy Denies Olof Palme's Involvement With KGB [TASS]	23
Shevardnadze, Dumas Discuss France-USSR Ties [NEW TIMES No 44]	23
NATO's Woerner Calls for Cooperation With USSR [TASS]	25
UN Security Council Seat for Germany Considered [Moscow Radio]	26
TASS Previews Gorbachev Visit to FRG	26
Genscher Urges West's Support for Soviet Reforms [TASS]	26
Article Urges Strengthening Ties With Germany [LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA No 34]	27
Moiseyev Sees Off Visiting Finnish Admiral [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Nov]	29
Officials Visit Finland To Discuss Human Rights [Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET 24 Oct] ...	29

Latin America & Caribbean

Politburo's Shenin Interviewed on Cuban Visit [PRAVDA 2 Nov]	31
Visits Shows 'Strong Ties' [PRAVDA 4 Nov]	32
Cuban Envoy Discusses Ties, Domestic Tasks [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Nov]	33
Cuba Says Krushchev 'Mistaken' on Missile Crisis [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Oct]	35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Chamber Views 'Crimean Question' [PRAVDA 2 Nov]	36
Deputy Arutyunyan Claims Speech 'Distortion' [IZVESTIYA 30 Oct]	36

Political & Social

CPSU Deputy Secretary Ivashko Interviewed [Moscow TV]	37
Army Mother Interviewed on Gorbachev Meeting [Moscow TV]	41
Moscow Party Chief Previews 7 Nov Rallies [Milan L'UNITA 4 Nov]	41
7 Nov Military Paraders Gather in Moscow [TASS]	43
Three Moscow Demonstrations Planned [TASS]	43
Official Views 'Provocation' [Hamburg DPA]	43
Generals Comment on Parade [Moscow Radio]	43
Patriarch Addresses Compatriots on GOSR [IZVESTIYA 6 Nov]	44
Republic Movements Form Coordinating Council [TASS]	45
Soviet General Denies Coup Being Planned [Paris LE FIGARO 3-4 Nov]	45
Gorbachev Greets Nongovernmental Commission [Moscow Radio]	46
Yazov Meets With Armed Forces' Deputies [TASS]	46
Central Committee Obtains Greater Role [PRAVDA 27 Oct]	46
Commission Examines Multiparty Relations [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 27 Oct]	48
CPSU Military Commission Members Listed [PRAVDA 31 Oct]	49
Draft Instruction on CPSU Elections [PRAVDA 30 Oct]	50
Interparty Forum Pledges 'Civic Consensus' [PRAVDA 31 Oct]	53
Commentary Supports Gorbachev's Foreign Visits [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Nov]	53
'Action Program-90' Authors Interviewed [LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Oct]	55
Reaction to Action Program-90 Publication [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 18 Oct]	57
Newspapers Develop in Oblasts [Moscow Radio]	58
MOLVA Fashion Newspaper Published in Moscow [Moscow TV]	58
Rules Governing Telephone Tapping Outlined [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 4 Nov]	58

Defense Plant Starts Producing Satellite Dishes [IZVESTIYA 23 Oct]	59
Seminar on International Cooperatives Held [TASS]	59
Roundtable Opens in Moscow on Jewish Traditions [IZVESTIYA 30 Oct]	59

Economic

State Bank Official on Ruble Exchange Rate [TASS]	60
AUCCTU Audit Commission Report Presented [TRUD 25 Oct]	60
Decree's Impact on Savings, Interest Viewed [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 28 Oct]	66
Perm Gas Pipeline Section Completed [Moscow Radio]	67
Russian Bonds Sold at 10 Percent Discount [Moscow Radio]	67
Altay Kray Feed Plant Stands Empty [Moscow TV]	67

Agricultural

Meeting Views 'Unsatisfactory' Grain Delivery [Moscow Radio]	68
Official Cited on Winter Food Supplies [PRAVDA 1 Nov]	68
Sugar Supply, Delivery Problems Discussed [Moscow Radio]	69

Scientific

Soviet, Japanese Cosmonauts Prepare 2 Dec Flight [TASS]	69
Work Continues Aboard Mir Space Station [TASS]	70

Military

General Batenian on Pact Disbandment [Hamburg DIE WELT 5 Nov]	70
Military Parade Participants at Kremlin Meeting [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Nov]	71
Drafts on Military-Political Organs Examined [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Nov]	71
Akhromeyev Rebuts Arbatov's 'Lies' [IZVESTIYA 1 Nov]	71
Mothers Demand Investigation Into Military [MOSCOW NEWS No 44]	72
Army Rear Services Discuss Transition to Market [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Nov]	73

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Lithuania Attempts To Prevent 7 Nov Celebrations	74
Passes Law on Public Holidays [PRAVDA 1 Nov]	74
Pro-CPSU Lithuanians To Celebrate [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Nov]	74
Vilnius Objects to Military Parade [Vilnius Radio]	74
Prunskiene Issues Decree [Vilnius Radio]	75
Lithuania Reiterates Demand for Troop Withdrawal [Vilnius Radio]	75
Prunskiene Says Relations With USSR Worsening [TASS]	75
Landsbergis Receives Visiting Swedish Delegation [Vilnius Radio]	76
Lithuania's Ozolas Views Negotiation Prospects [Vilnius International]	76
Union Bodies Refuse To Sign Lithuanian Deals [Vilnius Radio]	76
Lithuania, Armenia Sign Cooperation Accord [Vilnius Radio]	76
Conference Discusses Lithuanian Border Checks [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Nov]	77
Lithuanian Pro-Moscow Communists Discuss Press [TASS]	77
Arts, Sciences Quarterly Published in Lithuania [Vilnius International]	78
Tallinn Military Parade To Be Staged 7 Nov [Moscow International]	78
Estonian Communist Party Leader Assesses Issues [Tallinn Radio]	78
Estonian Plenum Discusses Economy, 21st Congress [TASS]	78
CPSU Secretariat Greet Estonian Communists [TASS]	79
Riga City Committee Discusses 7 Nov Celebration [Riga Radio]	79

RSFSR

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Activities Reported	79
New Publication Viewed [Moscow TV]	79
Deputies Called Soviet Power 'Pallbearers' [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Nov]	80

Resolution on Pulp, Paper Distribution	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Nov]	81
Resolution on Economic Program	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Nov]	81
Yeltsin Visits Sverdlosk Explosion Victims' Graves	[TASS]	81
Yeltsin Discusses Center-Republic Relations	[KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA 30 Sep]	82
Reform Program To Increase Kamchatka Unemployed	[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Oct]	87
RSFSR Politburo Meets With Local Leaders	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Nov]	87
Silayev, ROK Businessmen Discuss Trade Issues	[Moscow TV]	88
Hyundai President Cited	[TASS]	88
Kozyrev Discusses RSFSR's Foreign Priorities	[MOSCOW NEWS No 43]	89
Moscow To Rename Streets, Squares, Stations	[Moscow Radio]	89
'Army Workshop' Uncovered by KGB in Bryansk	[Moscow Radio]	89
Protest Fails To Halt Kemerovo CPSU Inventory	[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Oct]	90
Tver Oblast Mothballs Heavy Industry Projects	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Oct]	90
Udmurt Promotes Reform, Eliminates Gosplan	[IZVESTIYA 20 Oct]	90
Army Officer Elected Kamchatka Oblast Chairman	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct]	90
News Agency Begins Operation in Tatarstan	[PRAVDA 1 Nov]	91

Western Republics

Crisis Situation in the Gagauz Republic Continues		91
'Myths' Fueling Tension Cited	[IZVESTIYA 30 Oct]	91
Moscow Reports on Situation	[Moscow Radio]	92
Moldavia, Gagauz Open Talks	[TASS]	92
Coverage of Crisis Situation in Dnestr Republic		93
'Force' To Resolve Issues Continues	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Nov]	93
Thousands Attend Student Rally	[TASS]	93
Moldavian Women Begin Hunger Strike	[TASS]	93
Defense Against Moldavians Urged	[TASS]	93
Situation 'Remains Tense'	[TASS]	94
PRAVDA Reports on Moldavian Developments	[2 Nov]	94
Deputies Disagree Over Handling	[PRAVDA 3 Nov]	95
Deputies Criticize MVD Inaction	[IZVESTIYA 3 Nov]	95
Moldavia Orders Weapons Collection, Bans Groups	[TASS]	96
Moldavian Militia Check for Kishinev Profiteers	[Moscow TV]	96
Students To Blockade 7 Nov Kiev Military Parade	[Moscow Radio]	96
Lvov Declares 7 Nov No Longer State Holiday	[IZVESTIYA 2 Nov]	97
Ukrainian Party Appeals on October Anniversary	[PRAVDA UKRAINY 14 Oct]	97
Kravchuk Calls for Vote on Union Treaty	[PRAVDA UKRAINY 16 Oct]	98
Masol Resignation Reasoning Examined	[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 31 Oct]	99
Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Head on 'Crisis'	[PRAVDA UKRAINY 18 Oct]	101
Ukrainian Unity Demonstration Held in Bukovina	[Moscow TV]	102
Minsk Protestors To Disrupt 7 Nov Parade	[TRUD 4 Nov]	102

Caucasus

Armenian Businessman Views Economy	[ARMENPRES]	103
KGB Breaks-Up Armenian Weapons-Smuggling Ring	[TASS]	104
Armenian Commission To Study Amnesty Question	[ARMENPRES]	104
Armenia, Azerbaijan Prosecutors To Cooperate	[IZVESTIYA 2 Nov]	104

Central Asia

Plantations Created To Rehabilitate Aral Sea	[TASS]	105
Kirghizia' Akayev Interviewed on Future Goals	[PRAVDA 2 Nov]	105
Kirghizia Ratifies Law Allowing Media Independence	[Moscow Radio]	106
Tajikistan Decree Restricts Military Draft	[KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 9 Oct]	106
Uzbek-Belorussian Cooperation Agreement Signed	[Moscow Radio]	107

Commentator Warns Against Arms Transfers to South

PM0611103190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4

["My Opinion" article by PRAVDA Political Observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov: "Why Cast Boomerangs?"]

[Text] It never entered anyone's head that the end of the cold war could have undesirable side effects. But it is a historical paradox that the cessation of confrontation between East and West could give rise to a "threat from the South," if a wave of abandoned weapons hits the developing countries, fanning the coals of old regional conflicts and sparking off new ones. Yet each of them—as the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait illustrates—threatens to undermine international security, that is, they have a boomerang effect as far as we are concerned.

Even if military rivalry between the two superpowers becomes a thing of the past, it is doubtful whether the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America will smartly shrug off the cold war legacy: the confrontation mentality and the tendency to regard combat potential as the best guarantee of state independence and international prestige. The worldwide proliferation of mass destruction weapons is not a new problem. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was the first barrier against this danger. It has been subscribed to by over 140 states, which have gained access to the peaceful use of the atom in exchange for a commitment not to produce nuclear warheads.

For all its flaws, a nonproliferation arrangement does exist in this sphere. Which, unfortunately, cannot be said of missiles. Participants in ongoing or potential conflicts, such as Israel and Egypt, Iraq and Iran, India and Pakistan, are capable of producing them. The consequences of the former tiff between Moscow and Beijing were a factor here, as well as the rivalry between Washington and Moscow. In creating its missiles Delhi used, in particular, Soviet technology, while Islamabad used Chinese. Therefore it seems to me desirable that the USSR and the PRC should subscribe to the "big seven" accord: In 1987 the United States, Japan, the FRG, Britain, France, Italy, and Canada jointly decided to restrict exports of missiles and the technology for their production.

But the "threat from the South" which could replace the East-West confrontation is by no means confined to

nuclear warheads and ballistic missiles. In mid-November the Helsinki process participants are to sign an agreement in Paris on the radical reduction of forces and conventional armaments in Europe. Thousands of tanks, armored personnel carriers, guns, and aircraft are to be withdrawn. What could be more gratifying, you might think. But serious analysts in the West are displaying concern about something that really should worry us, too, lest there be a "pseudoconversion," that is, the transfer of this enormous mass of combat equipment to a Third World filled with contradictions.

Our long-standing opponents and recent partners have another cause for anxiety: First, the biggest reductions will fall to the lot of the Warsaw Pact countries and, second, it is the USSR and its allies that particularly need hard currency at the moment. Will the East be able to resist the temptation to put its affairs in order by selling tanks and guns? According to the forecasts, the annual volume of world weapons exports could again reach the record level of the early eighties: \$50-60 billion, compared with the current \$30-40 billion. I would hope that the relevant Soviet departments would be farsighted enough to avoid easy solutions which could be costly later.

Without questioning each state's right to individual and collective defense, it is time to devise precise rules governing the sale and supply of weapons and give them the formal shape of an international convention. The Soviet stance on this score is set out in a letter from the USSR foreign minister to the UN secretary general. In order to limit the flow of combat equipment from one region to another what is needed above all is glasnost. Moscow supports the idea that all countries submit annual data to the United Nations both on military budgets and on exports or imports of weapons. The register would aid the switch from superarmament to reasonable defense sufficiency, prevent the creation of offensive potentials, and stop the spread of the most lethal means of warfare.

Now that the cold war is over, it would be a good idea, I think, to create something along the lines of the notorious Coordinating Committee on Export Controls. Not to keep the West's scientific-technical achievements from the East, but to prevent the transfer of the arms race from the North to the South. Otherwise the great powers would not in fact be disarming but would be casting boomerangs at their own and others' expense.

Gorbachev-Baker Meeting Possibility Examined*LD0511171290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1430 GMT 5 Nov 90*

[Text] [Announcer] There have already been reports that Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and the U.S. secretary of state would meet in Geneva. Now it has become known that the meeting will take place in Moscow on 8 November and I would like to ask Viktor Levin, our diplomatic correspondent, to explain what has brought about this change in the venue for the meeting between the leaders of the foreign policy departments of the Soviet Union and the United States. I am handing over to my colleague:

[Levin] I have been told by a senior member of the staff of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs that, having compared the opportunities available to them, both Shevardnadze and Baker came to the conclusion that it would be more convenient for both of them to meet in Moscow.

As I understood it there was nothing supernatural in the fact that the location for the meeting had been changed. International events develop extremely quickly now: Contacts are implemented at various levels, including at the summit level. Naturally, heads of state do not meet as frequently as do ministers of foreign affairs but such meetings are of special importance. Moreover, when heads meet they are accompanied by ministers of foreign affairs. Now we have just received—literally just received—confirmation of what I would say is the extremely tense schedule facing Eduard Amvrosyevich Shevardnadze. Dieter Vogel, the official spokesman of the FRG Government, has stated in Bonn that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will visit the FRG this week on Friday and Saturday, that is, 9 and 10 November. It is envisioned that he and Chancellor Kohl will sign a treaty on good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation in Bonn and that on Saturday Mikhail Sergeyevich will visit the Palatinate, the chancellor's homeland.

This summer, as you will remember, Kohl stayed in Mikhail Sergeyevich's homeland, and now Mikhail Sergeyevich will be in the home area of Helmut Kohl. From this one can clearly conclude that the work is increasing and I repeat it is clear now, particularly clear, why Shevardnadze and Baker decided to hold their meeting in Moscow, although when I learned of this I immediately wondered whether Baker was counting on having a meeting with Gorbachev, the president of the Soviet Union? In reply—well, there is the well-trying form of words—there was neither confirmation nor denial of my supposition. For my own part I will say that a meeting of that kind would indeed lend special weight to Baker's visit to Moscow. But, as the Americans say, it takes two to tango, and it is difficult to say whether Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will have the opportunity to meet with Baker, although I am also sure that he will not have to rest on 8 November.

Gorbachev, Shevardnadze Meet New Ambassadors*LD0511210890 Moscow TASS in English 1915 GMT
5 Nov 90*

[Text] Moscow November 5 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev accepted credentials at the Kremlin today from ambassadors of Mongolia—Nyamyn Mishigdorzh, of Belgium—Tierry de Gruben, of Mexico—Carlos Tello Macias, of the Sudan—Ibrahim Muhammad Ali, of Portugal—Antonio Leal da Costa Lobo, of the Netherlands—Joris Michael Vos, of Iran—Nematollah Yazdi, of Canada—Michael Richard Bell, of New Zealand—Gerald Reginald McGee, of Guinea Bissau—Sherif Toure, of Austria—Friedrich Bauer, of Tunisia—Slaheddine Abdallah, of Costa Rica—Arturo Robles Arias, of Peru—Armando Lecarosa de Cossio and of Yemen—Ali 'Abdallah al-Bujayri.

The ceremony was attended by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. [Moscow Television Service in Russian's "Vremya" newscast at 1800 GMT on 5 November adds that "following the presentation of credentials, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev conversed with the new ambassadors."]

Film on Wallenberg Opens in Moscow*LD0111215890 Moscow TASS in English 2126 GMT
1 Nov 90*

[By TASS correspondent Anna Tatarinova]

[Text] Moscow November 1 TASS—The "Mission of Raoul Wallenberg" documentary, the opening night of which took place in Moscow today, is the first attempt of Soviet film makers to depict this outstanding personality whose fate was so tragic and mysterious.

The scenario was written by playwright Leonid Gurevich. The film was directed by Aleksandr Rodnyanskiy who is a member of the international expert commission on the Wallenberg case.

The film authors began collecting materials about the Swedish diplomat who had saved several dozen thousand Jews during the Second World War, when the Soviet public at large did not know anything about Wallenberg.

"The destiny of the great humanist of the 20th Century will not leave indifferent anybody: On saving the life to many people, he fell victim of tyranny and lawlessness," Gurevich told TASS today.

"There are many blank spots in the last years of his life, although the fact of his arrest by Soviet military authorities in Budapest in January 19, 1945 is documented. Many subsequent developments are unclear," he noted.

The film authors challenged the official version set out by former Soviet deputy foreign minister Andrey Gromyko in 1957, according to which Wallenberg died of infarction at the Lubyanka Prison in Moscow in July 1947.

"Incidentally, this version was rejected by his kin and kith and numerous foreign researchers of his life," Gurevich noted.

The film depicts various versions of Wallenberg's life in the USSR. The film makers visited various Soviet cities and talked with many people who, according to their claims, had met him.

They also shot the film in prisons in Moscow and Vladimir, in former concentration camps in the Kolyma River area and Perm region where the Swedish diplomat might have been imprisoned.

The film makers were also in Hungary, Sweden and Israel. They interviewed people saved by Wallenberg from the Budapest ghetto. Cinema-goers will also see his relatives—sister Nina Lagergren and brother Guy von Dardel and visited the USSR last year.

The film stresses that Andrey Sakharov was the first in the Soviet Union to display interest in Wallenberg's fate.

The film authors has drawn the conclusion: Wallenberg's file has been preserved. It is in the KGB archives and is waiting for its publication.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Meets ROK Business Leader in Moscow

LD0511184290 Moscow TASS in English 1819 GMT
5 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 5 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev today received Chong Chu-yong, founder and honorary chairman of South Korea's Hyundai group and president of the Korean-Soviet Economic Association.

They discussed a wide range of issues related to the development of economic relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea.

They pointed to the mutually advantageous nature of trade relations between the two countries and joint investment activity by Soviet and South Korean enterprises.

Possible Meeting Between Korean Leaders Viewed

PM0211150590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 Oct 90 Union Edition p 4

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Lukashin: "Pyongyang-Seoul: Is There To Be a Summit?"]

[Text] Pyongyang—On 22 October, in a review of the week's most important news, Seoul radio again focused attention on DPRK President Kim Il-song's willingness to meet with No Tae-u. The first to report this sensational news was AFP, followed by the Japanese papers ASAHI and MAINICHI.

We hope, a Seoul radio commentator stressed, that the third conference between the premiers of North and South, which opens on 11 December in Seoul, will be more constructive and that progress will be made at it, paving the way for an historic meeting between Kim Il-song and No Tae-u.

What does Pyongyang think about it? As far as the media are concerned, nothing has been reported so far about a possible meeting between the presidents. The papers published on 22 October neither confirm the reports from Paris, Tokyo, and Seoul, nor deny them. It is also curious that on 18 October, the very day when President Kim Il-song received a delegation from the South, your correspondent attended a DPRK Foreign Ministry news conference and put the following question to North delegation member Han Pyong-su: "Was the possibility of a meeting between the two presidents discussed during the talks?" His answer was short and sweet: "No"....

Prospects for Cooperation in Northeast Asia Noted

SK0311082090 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1100 GMT 1 Nov 90

[Unattributed report from the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Excerpts] An international conference has taken place in Ulaanbaatar. The conference was entitled: Basic Issues on Cooperation in Northeast Asia and their solutions. Our station reporter has talked with (Wecheslav Stikov), adviser at the Soviet Embassy in Mongolia, who participated in this conference.

He said: When they assess the political situation in Northeast Asia, people generally point out that affirmative changes are taking place. [passage omitted] Also, dialogue on the Korean peninsula and the establishment of diplomatic relations between Seoul and Moscow were also discussed at the meeting. [passage omitted] I point out that there are factors that hinder international cooperation in Northeast Asia. They are: the Korean question, which remains unsolved; a series of border disputes; the lack of formal relations between Beijing and Seoul, between Tokyo and Pyongyang, and between Pyongyang and Washington; the isolationist policy of the DPRK; social and political developments in Mongolia, the DPRK, and other countries in this region and [word indistinct] of their political structures; and weak infrastructures in this region. Among them, the issue of how to prevent conflicts on the Korean peninsula is the most acute one. The opinion of Scalapino, a renowned U.S. political scholar is interesting. That is, the North and South must recognize each other and take measures to promote trust; toward this end, forces must be significantly reduced along the border, forces in other areas must also be fundamentally reduced, and [words indistinct]; the two Korean sides must develop economic and cultural exchange, establish joint-venture companies, and promote the exchange of people; the powers must cross-recognize Pyongyang and Seoul; and two Koreas must be allowed to enter the United Nations and other international organizations, and the United States must revise its policy toward the peninsula, reduce its forces based in this area, and the annual "Team Spirit" military exercise must be scaled down. When these political issues are resolved, Northeast Asia will turn into a stage for broad international cooperation in economic and other sectors. Good prospects for development will truly open. When the abundant natural resources of the Soviet Union, the cheap labor of China and North Korea, and the capital and technology of the developed capitalist countries in this region are combined, prospects will be very bright. [passage omitted]

Popov Interviewed on Japan, Taiwan Deals

PM0211123590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 90 p 3

[Interview with Moscow City Soviet Chairman Gavriil Popov by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent N. Tsvetkov in Tokyo, date not given; under the rubric: "At First Hand"; "Why Popov Went to Japan"]

[Text] Tokyo—On 20 October KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reported on the visit of the Moscow City Soviet chairman and his first deputy to the Japanese islands. In an interview with our correspondent in Tokyo

G.Kh. Popov explained that he used his vacation for the journey, which also included a two-day visit to Taiwan.

"The trip is unofficial," Gavriil Kharitonovich began our interview. "I was coming here in connection with the publication of my book: It emerged, however, that many Japanese organizations, companies, and officials wanted meetings. Simultaneously it emerged via the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that the Tokyo leadership, outstripping the development of relations with the Soviet Union, wanted to conclude a direct agreement with Moscow. In this instance our wishes and the ministry's coincided. I mean both the Japanese and the Union Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Therefore it was decided that Sergey Borisovich Stankevich would come with me—for the official part of the visit.

"What was actually achieved? In all honesty, little. Of course, unorthodox solutions were needed—that is, to ensure that Japanese companies, the government, and banks concluded direct agreements with the Russian Government, with Moscow, Leningrad, and so on, that is, with those regions in which the Japanese are confident and know that what they allocate will be utilized effectively and not squandered or wasted ineptly.

"They understand all this. But, of course, they are still not prepared to undertake such actions. But, frankly, we did not actually demand this from them. Our proposal was for the Soviet Union to be the recipient of credit, but within the credit framework they should guarantee the allocation of tranches to the authorities of Russia and Moscow, say, but once again for the implementation of specific projects. In principle this idea was supported here. But how far it will be implemented.... I fear that the worst-case scenario already familiar to us will be adopted whereby the proposed partners are afraid to give the USSR Government sizable credits, considering the situation in the country unstable, but also do not venture to tell the USSR president to take up the credits together with us. Therefore they are giving a sort of slice which, in my opinion, is completely insufficient—\$1 billion, \$2 billion, \$3 billion. And we have only to pay \$10-12 billion for old debts in the coming year. The thing to do is to collect money so as simply not to be bankrupt. I think the West's lack of dynamism has an effect here. I am not talking about my own country. The only situation in which the West would dare to come to our aid is a left-center coalition, that is, an alliance between Gorbachev and the forces behind him and the radicals. But, unfortunately, this process, begun in the summer, collapsed because of the government's desperate resistance. And behind government resistance there is, of course, resistance from the military-industrial complex.

"The Japanese did not reject the idea itself, and the talks will be continued. There were also other gestures from their side providing evidence that they want to do business with us. They allocated over \$1 million simply by way of a present to Moscow. Leading companies—Toyota and others."

[Tsvetkov] In money?

[Popov] In goods. We concluded talks on the basis that it will be in goods. Automobile companies naturally offered automobiles. We will take automobiles. We will take televisions, refrigerators, video recorders, and so on from electrical companies. We added that there is no sense in giving out these things to the have-nots in Moscow. It is no use even if they are put in a lottery. Therefore we decided to use rather an exotic system, and the Japanese agreed with us: We will take the goods from them and organize an auction sale in Moscow. By our estimates, a Japanese car will go for 100,000-200,000 rubles [R].

[Tsvetkov] New cars, not secondhand ones?

[Popov] New, of course. They will be delivered from Europe.

[Tsvetkov] When will all this happen?

[Popov] Before the new year. And by the new year we will set up a fund—a minimum of R10 million must be obtained. And from this fund we will be able to give material help to all those whose pension is less than R100. We have two million pensioners in Moscow and around 500,000 of them receive less than R100.

[Tsvetkov] What would your comment be on the fact that the Japanese press is calling you one of the pro-Japanese Soviet politicians?

[Popov] I really believe that Japan is one of the main countries toward which the Soviet Union must firmly orient itself in the long term. There is a basis here for several years—decades—of cooperation. Japan is an overcrowded island, devoid of any resources, populated with a people inclined toward high-technology processes. But we, however efficiently we develop and whatever economy we create—our economy's raw material component will certainly be very great. We should not be primitive, we should not export crude oil but should refine it and earn money. And round timber should not be exported but processed. Our population growth rate is not such that an overpopulation problem will arise in the next 50 years. That is, in this geopolitical sense there is a basis for long-term cooperation lasting many years.

Russia did have such cooperation with West Europe at one time. Russia existed with this for approximately 200 if not 300 years from Peter the Great's time. West Europe was industrialized and Russia exported grain and meat, successfully carving out a niche in the European system.

[Tsvetkov] Do they have an economic interest in us?

[Popov] They did have for many years. Then they did not for a time. Now it is beginning to reappear. After all, they resolved their problems five or so years ago. They get oil from the Near East and raw materials from Latin America. They thought that they would survive without us but it turned out that they are not surviving. The Near

East proved not such a reliable thing. The population in Latin America is growing at such a rate that tomorrow they will not have enough raw materials for themselves. If the Chinese double or triple their living standard, they too will start to experience a shortage of their own raw material. In this way changes are inevitable. I speak on the basis of the discussions with everyone I met.

[Tsvetkov] A few words about Taiwan.

[Popov] As you know, our country does not suffer from a lack of Taiwanese goods. The natural question arises: Why must we pay someone over the odds for all this? Before it reaches us? I was at a plant which produces raw material for our textile industry. The Taiwanese showed me everything that comes to us and said: "This is costing you so much." If we switch to the market we must operate by market laws: Buying where it is cheaper and not being embarrassed that we are buying where it is cheaper. The interest from the Taiwanese side is great and I think that economic relations will advance substantially. Their prices suit us.

[Tsvetkov] The visit there was unofficial?

[Popov] Yes, of course.

[Tsvetkov] Do you therefore expect complications over this in Soviet-Chinese relations?

[Popov] No.

Mongolian Press Criticizes Soviet Legacy

*OW0211081690 Moscow Television Service
in Russian 1900 GMT 30 Oct 90*

[Commentary by M. Osokin; from the "120 Minutes" program]

[Text] A lot is being said today about the complexity of our relationships with Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other former socialist countries. However, the problem is not confined to East Europe. Now a word from our commentator.

[Osokin] In Mongolia, in recent times one hears new claims in the newspapers, although these are old claims that were not voiced under the former leadership. However, since the Mongolian papers are now wholeheartedly writing about this, then I think it is worthwhile for us to know about this, too. So let us look at the report from Ulaanbaatar.

These were the first multiparty parliamentary elections and were held in Mongolia this summer. It was then that public debates reached a new level. In the pre-election struggle, many claims were voiced in the sphere of internal politics, in particular, concerning relations with the Soviet Union. The topics were varied and ranged from the Ulaanbaatar Railroad—which still has not been handed over to Mongolia despite the initial agreement—to what some call unfair terms of trade. As the opposition newspaper UG put it: The country opened its

pantries, but foreigners feel at home in them. By the paper's reckoning, Mongolia supplied the Soviet Union with meat, livestock, and other agricultural products at prices far below world price levels.

The fact that exploitation of the (Morday) uranium mine by Soviet miners was concealed for many years was another assertion that surfaced before the elections. In view of the economic factors, there was concern that the uranium mine may become a second Chernobyl.

The newspaper ARDYN ERH recalls the (Dastuul) salt mountain. According to the paper, when the question of the Soviet-Mongolian border was being decided in the late fifties, this location in the west of the country—by the will of Tsedenbal, the leader at the time—suddenly found itself on foreign soil.

In recent weeks, new topics have been added to this, for example, the presence of Soviet troops in Mongolia. The papers write that even though at the beginning of this century the Russian consul sought special permission to gather firewood on the forbidden Bogdo Mountain, today dachas of Soviet military commanders, as well as a large military facility, are located on its sacred slopes. It also writes that as a result of Soviet artillery practice considerable damage was done to such a unique feature of nature as the Mirror Mountain in the Gobi. We do not have film sequences of this. I have not seen film of Soviet military maneuvers in Mongolia, but let us have a look at the film we do have, which illustrates one more problem.

In Mongolia, many still live in such conditions, and the housing question is acute, but the reaction to all this takes on its own peculiar form. This year, many Soviet citizens left Ulaanbaatar for home and the occupation of their vacated quarters became widespread, causing clashes between various groups. Among the house-breakers were teachers of the Polytechnic and Pedagogic Institutes, as well as the methodologist of the Palace of Pioneers. In the words of the newspaper UNEN, this unprecedented Mongolian event creates an alarming trend. Lawbreakers go from seizures of vacated quarters to direct threats against the remaining specialists in the country, mainly from the Soviet Union and Bulgaria.

Generally a wide variety of topics surfaced, from historic resentments to modern conflicts, and finally comparisons that put us in a very unflattering light. One such comparison from a critical article on the government, in the newspaper ARDCHILAL, notes that perestroika cannot be achieved with large numbers of leaders nor by the might of the apparatus, as the example of the Elder Brother attests.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Prospects for Cambodian Peace Assessed

*BK0211140690 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia
1230 GMT 1 Nov 90*

[Commentary by station observer Viktor Valentinov]

[Text] Indonesia and France are planning to convene another international meeting in mid-November to discuss the solution to the Cambodian problem. This meeting which is expected to be held in Jakarta will be a prelude to another Paris International Conference on Cambodia. Our observer, Comrade Viktor Valentinov, has this comment:

Before the meeting in the Indonesian capital is held, the four Cambodian political forces might be able to convene the second meeting of their Supreme National Council [SNC]. As is known to all, during their first meeting in Bangkok, the Cambodian parties did not reach an agreement on who should take up the post of SNC chairman. This has caused the SNC to become inactive and the Cambodian seat at the United Nations to remain vacant, thus preventing the United Nations from fulfilling its pacification mission.

At present, all circles concerned are making immense efforts to help persuade the Cambodian parties to compromise in order to eliminate the remaining obstacles on the road toward rebuilding peace in Cambodia through a cease-fire.

In my opinion, it is now very hopeful because following much efforts, there have been apparent signs of compromise between Hanoi and Beijing regarding the Cambodian problem. As is generally known, a meeting was held recently in an area south of China between the top leaders of the two countries, that is Comrade Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Communist Party of China Central Committee, and Comrade Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee.

According to SRV Foreign Minister Comrade Nguyen Co Thach, the two leaders reached unanimous opinion on almost all aspects of the Cambodian solution. In my view, this unanimity will bring about fruitful results in the near future.

At the same time, Phnom Penh's peace diplomacy has proceeded actively. Australian Deputy Foreign Minister Michael Costello has paid successive visits to the Cambodian capital. The details of his talks there were not fully known. But it can be said that each of Mr. Michael Costello's working visits in Phnom Penh always accompanied by new peace initiatives from the government of the State of Cambodia.

I hope that the meeting which will be held in Jakarta within the next two weeks will bring similar results. In my opinion, there is enough time for the Cambodian parties to settle their remaining problems and prepare a progressive step for the international conference to proceed toward reaching a genuine solution.

The only important step that the entire international community is waiting for is the cease-fire in Cambodia. Following the end of the bloodshed that has dragged on for (?20) years, all these steps will certainly open ways for the establishment of a transitional government. As for

the transitional cabinet which will cooperate with the UN apparatus, it will be busy with the work to eradicate all the bad consequences arising from the war and to organize the democratically general elections.

By looking back, one can see that the road that has been taken is long. Unexpectedly, several difficult problems have been settled. Not only have the Cambodian parties sat together and talked, but they have also taken part in the joint administrative organization, that is the Cambodian SNC. Judging from the problems that had been resolved, the selection of the SNC chairman is just a minor, technical problem. However, this is just a view from the sidelines. As for the Cambodian parties which have fought against each other for several years, whatever step or gesture always links with political significance. Each step that they took was taken through great pains and much bloodshed and [words indistinct].

Success or failure of the negotiation will affect the development of the war. However, I think that the end of the war has become apparent. The Jakarta meeting might draw this end even nearer, our observer, Comrade Viktor Valentinov, concludes.

ASEAN Economic Ministers Conference Viewed

BK0311064190 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia
1300 GMT 31 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent Viktor Konov from Jakarta]

[Text] The ASEAN Economic Ministers' Conference has just concluded. The regional association groups Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore, and the Philippines. The conference was held in Bali. High on the agenda of the conference was to further improve bilateral cooperation among the six member countries.

The regional group's economic situation had shown dynamic improvement in recent years. In economic and trade relations, ASEAN member countries recently turned their attention toward Japan, the United States, and Western Europe. The six-member regional group is currently interested in fostering more active participation and widening of bilateral relations among themselves.

However, it is untrue that ASEAN is only giving special attention to its member countries in connection with greater bilateral cooperation. The delegates to the regional conference were of the opinion that ASEAN could be turned into structural or joint economic centers which are currently being established in the Asian-Pacific region. ASEAN is actively advocating its right to set up such an establishment to meet the current stiff competition being faced by Japan and Australia. It should be reminded that such a goal should not be over-emphasized. ASEAN had made dynamic improvement in its development within the last decade. It can be said that the regional grouping's overall annual economic growth stands between seven to nine percent

which is considered a record achievement within the Asian-Pacific or other regions. At least one of ASEAN's members, Singapore, is currently acclaimed as a newly industrialized country and Malaysia is currently making preparations to overcome [word indistinct].

In regional and international conferences, ASEAN is currently interested in exerting more efforts to attract more viable investors for the present and the future from important Asian-Pacific regional markets.

The Soviet Union had expressed its interest in fostering closer cooperation with the regional grouping's member countries. We would like to note that in this connection, the Soviet leader, Nikolay Ryzhkov, conducted an official visit to Thailand and Singapore last February. During a special meeting, numerous Singaporean industrialists stated that by fostering more progressive bilateral economic relations with Singapore, the Soviet Union could be provided with a golden opportunity to participate in regional and international markets.

Near East & South Asia

Primakov Views Talks With Iraq's Saddam

LD0311185390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1545 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Interview with Presidential Council member Ye.M. Primakov by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given; from the "International Panorama" program—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] What is the potential for common sense—if one can put it like that—among the opposing sides? Is it great, or is the opposite true?

[Primakov] Generally speaking, I understand that the issue is very complex, because on the one hand it is necessary, without a doubt, to make Iraq leave Kuwait. The whole world community should attempt to achieve this and in such a way that Iraq leaves unrewarded for what it has done. A very delicate boundary exists which is possibly difficult to even determine—between rewarding Iraq on the one hand, and on the other granting it the opportunity to save face when it leaves. Then it also has its own problems, after all, which it would like to resolve. At the same time, the concern of those who live in the vicinity of Iraq is understandable, as is their striving to obtain a certain guarantee for the future so that what has happened in Kuwait will not be repeated.

Concern also exists within Iraq itself. For example, I said frankly to Saddam Husayn: Did he not have some kind of [word indistinct] complex, like the Israelis, to the effect that they are surrounded on all sides, that it was necessary, lowering one's head, to leave these surroundings, that it would be better to die than to surrender, and so on. [sentence as heard] They are thus faced with the question either to capitulate or to die. They are faced with the question either to return and live in a normal,

civilized society, subordinating themselves to the laws of this civilization and demanding the protection of their own interests, unconditionally, or to have a common—some kind of action—that could occur in extreme form.

Reports View, Assess Baker's Mideast Tour

Purpose Examined

LD0511160790 Moscow World Service in English
1210 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Oleg Shchedrov commentary]

[Text] A visit to Bahrain is the first leg of an overseas tour by the U.S. Secretary of State, James Baker, who will also visit Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Turkey, the USSR, Britain, and France. On Tuesday, Mr. Baker will have a meeting with the Chinese foreign minister who is also setting out on a working visit to the Gulf area. More from Oleg Shchedrov:

What is the purpose of Mr. Baker's tour? Does he intend to consult allies on the eve of a military action or is he going to try still to avoid an armed clash with Iraq? On the one hand the position of Iraq remains tough since it refuses to act on the demands of the international community to pull out from Kuwait. A few days ago the speaker of the Iraqi parliament, Sa'di Mahdi Salih, rejected a package of proposals brought to Baghdad by Yevgeniy Primakov, a special envoy of the Soviet president.

At the present time, the economic sanctions of the UN Security Council do not seem to justify so far the hopes pinned on them. Under these circumstances, statements by U.S. leaders are increasingly more hawkish and the prospects of a war starting becomes increasingly real. On the other hand, the feasibility of a direct armed clash with Iraq is lately doubted to an increasing extent, including in the United States itself. Opinion polls show that U.S. support for a military solution of the conflict is declining. There is also a decreasing desire to take part in a war among some allies, including France and Spain.

The U.S. military claim that for an operation to succeed, the multinational troops in the region should be trebled and brought up to a total of one million men.

The consequences of a war in the region remain unpredictable. Of course, above all, this is due to the possible use by Iraq of chemical and biological weapons. The experience of using chemical weapons in a large-scale military conflict is limited so far to the World War I and no one knows the scope of possible human casualties and the harm to the natural environment. Aside from that, specialists fear that Saddam Husayn will act on his threat to set on fire the oil wells in Iraq and Kuwait. If this threat were carried out it would be virtually impossible to put out the fires and within two or three weeks, a considerable part of the world crude oil stocks would

burn with the products of the fires polluting the atmosphere worldwide. All these factors have to be taken into account.

But what can still be expected from Mr. Baker's tour, from his talks with the allies in the region and outside it? Some judgement can be made from the decision of President Bush to visit Saudi Arabia and Egypt in the last 10 days of this month. According to reports, the U.S. President intends to bless the soldiers to active operations which shows that a war is still possible. But there is no need to draw hasty conclusions. There is still time and hopes remain for averting a war.

Solutions Considered

LD0611184490 Moscow TASS in English 0831 GMT
6 Nov 90

[Text] Cairo November 6 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker met King Fahd of Saudi Arabia on Monday night to discuss cooperation between the kingdom and the United States in resolving the Gulf crisis.

Baker, on a tour of several Gulf states, also had talks with the Bahrain leadership and met Kuwaiti Amir Jabir Al-Sabah.

Today Baker is expected to arrive in Cairo for talks with President Husni Mubarak of Egypt.

Baker will also visit Ankara, London, Paris and Moscow.

In Cairo, he is due to meet visiting Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen.

Baker's current aim is to discuss the details of a military operation against Iraq, according to several Arab news organizations.

"No to talks with Saddam Husayn until he withdraws troops from Kuwait!" Mubarak said in an interview with French television.

The beginning of talks with Iraq now would be a concession to Saddam Husayn, he said. If the Iraqi leader genuinely strives for a peaceful, political settlement of the conflict, he should unconditionally and completely withdraw troops from Kuwait, he said.

A peaceful solution was still possible, Mubarak said, hoping that international sanctions against Iraq will force Saddam Husayn to withdraw from Kuwait.

Dutch Defence Minister Berend Voorst had a different opinion of the situation. "There is now practically no hope of a peaceful settlement," Voorst told reporters in Dubayy after talks with United Arab Emirates Army leaders.

A military operation by the multinational forces to free Kuwait is a more realistic solution, he said.

Socialist International Chairman Willy Brandt has arrived in Baghdad to discuss the freeing of Western hostages with Saddam Husayn, the MENA News Agency reports.

In case of military actions, the first Iraqi missiles will head for Israel, Iraq will not hesitate to use chemical and biological weapons against Israel and Saudi Arabia, the Tunisian AL-SABAH newspaper quoted PLO leader Yasir 'Arafat as saying.

'Arafat is certain that U.S. threats to use unconventional weapons against Iraq unties Saddam Husayn's hands to use binary chemical shells, the newspaper said.

Palestinian Leader Urges Peaceful Solution in Gulf

PM0611090890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
5 Nov 90 Union Edition p 3

[Report by G. Deyev under the rubric "Panorama of International Life": "Hawatimah Press Conference"]

[Text] A meeting between journalists and Nayif Hawatima, general secretary of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine [DFLP], was held at the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Asian and African Countries. Answering questions about the results of his visit to Moscow, he said, in part:

"We have held a series of talks with Soviet officials. Their main theme was methods of settling the Persian Gulf crisis.

"Our delegations at the talks have come to the common opinion that it is necessary to activize diplomatic and political efforts for a peaceful solution to the Persian Gulf crisis.

"After talks with Saddam Husayn in Baghdad, we had the impression that the Iraqi leadership is prepared to discuss political methods to settle the Gulf crisis. We are continuing to activize our political efforts in this direction. The DFLP leadership is calling for an international conference under UN auspices, which would examine the whole complex of problems connected with a Near East settlement."

Commentaries Assess Persian Gulf Conflict

Soviet Role Viewed

91UF0095A Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian No 41, 12 Oct 90 pp 18-19

[Article by Aleksandr Smirnov: "On the Edge of the Abyss"—passage in italics published in box]

[Text] Aleksandr Smirnov is an Arabist and journalist specializing in international affairs. He worked in Arab countries for more than 15 years. He has witnessed military coups in Syria and civil wars in Yemen and Lebanon, the Israeli invasion of Beirut, the inglorious campaign of the Western "Multinational Force" off the shores of Lebanon, Islamic uprisings, and scenes of Arab

fraternity and Arab confrontation. He has worked in the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY for more than quarter of a century. He is a candidate of historical sciences; this year he was awarded the prize of the Moscow organization of the Journalists Union for a series of articles on problems of the Near East.

The military and political confrontation in the Persian Gulf zone is intensifying with every passing day. One spark, and this giant bonfire will set the whole world in flames and scorch in one way or another dozens of countries, even those at a respectable distance from Kuwait and Baghdad. Without any doubt, the immediate and main cause of the present crisis was in the true meaning of this word the terrorist actions of the Iraqi ruler—the seizure of Kuwait and the game with the hostages, inconceivable for the civilized world of the end of the 20th century....

But to really understand all the underlying causes of the drama occurring in the Gulf region and understand why millions of Arabs are prepared with weapon in hand to act in support of Iraq in its confrontation with a large part of the modern world community, and why the Palestinians under Israeli occupation or driven by the latter from their homeland are not all that strongly condemning another occupier, it is essential to look into the history of this region and analyze in somewhat greater depth its painful contradictions.

Intricate complexes brought about by the discrepancy between their illustrious historical past and yesterday's ambitions and hopes on the one hand and the quite joyless present-day reality on the other are now dominating the consciousness of millions of Arabs. Powerful medieval empires and the upsurge of the liberation movement and pan-Arab solidarity following World War II—and the present comminution of the Arab world into 23 states which are a part of infirm rival groupings or in a state of isolation. The victories of Muhammad and the caliphs and their commanders such as Saladin, the expulsion of the Crusaders, the successful struggle against the colonialists—and the humiliating defeats by Israel with its population of merely four million. The unique combination in various Arab countries of giant reserves of oil, gas, every conceivable type of raw material, labor resources, agricultural possibilities, financial resources, and scientific and cultural traditions—and the incapacity of the Arabs to create their own efficient common market, the total dependence on food and modern technology imports, and the domination of Western culture.

Not long ago the important Arab political scientist Muhammad Heykal published in London's THE TIMES an article showing the other side of the Iraq-Kuwait conflict. We have to agree with a number of its conclusions, particularly as regards the historically unjust distribution of material wealth between different parts of the Arab world. Since the early Middle Ages Arab history has been created in Cairo, Baghdad, Damascus, and the ancient cities of Morocco. The economic and spiritual

renaissance of the Arabs following centuries of Ottoman rule was also secured by the forces of the progressive part of the population of these cities with the addition of Beirut and Arab Jerusalem. The Arabs shed their blood in the struggle for independence in Morocco's Atlas mountains, on the slopes of the high hills of Algeria's Kabylia, in the Druze cities of Syria and Lebanon, on the streets of Damascus and Al Khalil, in the Radfan mountains in South Yemen, and on the shores of the Suez Canal. Syria, Jordan, and Iraq have sustained colossal losses, material primarily, in wars and conflicts on account of Palestine. The pan-Arab struggle for just national interests led to a sharp increase in Arab countries' revenue from the production and sale of oil.

But, it has transpired that almost three-fourths of the Arab world's financial resources have come to be at the disposal of seven ruling families of the Arabian Peninsula, the majority of which were 60-70 years ago even ordinary tribal leaders in receipt of a monthly stipend from British intelligence agents which rarely exceeded 1,000 pounds sterling. And earlier even they had been paid in Indian colonial rupees.

None of this means that the rulers of the Arab coast of the Persian Gulf were poor patriots or Muslims or that their power was tyrannical. Rather the opposite. Prior to 2 August 1990 Kuwait had been the country with the most liberal and even democratic regime in the Gulf region. Its assistance to its needy Arab brothers and the Palestinian exiles was very substantial. It is just as unfounded to say also that the power of the al-Sabah dynasty could be illegitimate. To judge from the standpoint of Western democratic standards, no regime in the Arab world, as in the majority of developing countries also, came to power as the result of general, free, and direct elections. It is true that Kuwait was for a long time formally a part of the Ottoman Empire's al-Basrah Province and had in the past been administered from the territory of present-day Iraq. But in the mid-19th century even the shaykhs of Kuwait achieved for themselves considerable autonomy and at the end of the century put themselves under British protection or, rather, were forced to do so. But ultimately present-day Iraq within its borders was also a creation of British colonial policy. Its first authoritative ruler, King Faysal from the Hashemite house, descendants of the Prophet Muhammad, was put in power by the actions of a small group of British Arabist intelligence officers. As everywhere in the East, the British made great exertions to entangle and enmesh a multitude of dangerous knots in relations between local rulers. In 1922 in the small town of Ukayr, the experienced colonial fox Percy Cox on behalf of Iraq and a certain Major George Moore "representing" Kuwait, in company with the strong ruler of Najd, the future king 'Abd al-'Aziz ibn Sa'ud, thoroughly redrew the borders in the Gulf. To their horror, the Kuwaitis learned that four-fifths of the territory of their shaykhdom (where the main Saudi oil fields are now located) were given to Najd, and in exchange Kuwait had obtained the two strategic islands of Bubyah and Warbah, which bar Iraq's outlet to the Persian Gulf and to

which Iraq has, not unfoundedly, laid claim. And many such delayed-action mines were laid on the shores of the Gulf.

Ultimately the main financial possibilities of the Arab world proved not to be where its main industrial and intellectual centers are located, and no generous "fraternal" assistance with money has been able to smooth over this contradiction. A well-known Yemeni poet bitterly wrote: "Why have the children of barefoot and half-clothed nomads become powerful masters, and we—the descendants of the ancient kings and architects of Yemen—have ended up indigent?" King Husayn—a direct descendant of Muhammad, whose great-grandfather Sherif Husayn and his forefathers were for centuries rulers of Hejaz, the province of the sacred places of Islam—recently complained that when he asked one of his wealthy Gulf monarch colleagues on the last occasion to help him cope with the economic crisis, the latter asked him: "Why have you Jordanians, who have no oil, built so many highways, television centers, and hospitals? You should live within your means."

But it is not only the consequences of the uneven distribution of the colossal wealth of the Arab world—this present-day Aladdin's Cave—which have given rise to the sympathy, incomprehensible to people of the West, of a considerable part of the "Arab street" for Iraq and its brutal actions. Had Saudi Arabia turned for assistance not to the United States and its NATO allies but to other Arab and Muslim countries, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait would not have been followed by such a contradictory reaction in the Arab world.

Whatever the case, the attitude toward the Western military presence on Arab soil is, for all that, among the majority of Arabs negative. Too alive in their collective memory are the centuries of wars against the "Franks," the crusades, the raids and assault landings from Western ships, the decades of occupation and unequal treaties, and the long transfer of the wealth and assets of the Arab region across the seas and oceans. With all its soldiers in the region, Israel is associated in Arab public opinion with the West also. The "Arab street" does not forget America's constant support for all Israel's actions against the Palestinians and other Arabs and the dozens of instances of U.S. diplomacy's torpedoing and scuppering of all practical sanctions of the United Nations in respect of the aggressor.

In addition, the buildup of the U.S. military strike force took place very rapidly, in accordance with operational plans drawn up in advance. In the Arab countries there are few people who believe that even if it expels the Iraqis from Kuwait the U.S. military machine will leave the shores of the Persian Gulf. There is much corroborative support for this. According to information of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, high-ranking American military figures are secretly drawing up long-term plans providing for the continuation of a substantial American military presence in the Persian Gulf region. They are seeking from Saudi Arabia permission for the permanent

presence there of a contingent of approximately 10,000 U.S. servicemen and they also wish to create around the whole region a system of air bases following a settlement of the present crisis. These plans anticipate colossal stockpiles of weapons and equipment for use in any emergency situation in the future being left behind in this region, including Israel, under U.S. control.

Clearly, the United States' long-term military presence in the Near and Middle East, which is close to us, cannot contribute to the USSR's interests even in the era of the new political thinking. Nor would any direct participation by the Soviet Union in military operations outside of the UN framework be useful to our interests. It would be extremely ruinous for us were the Soviet Union to be too closely associated with the United States in Arab public opinion. The interests of the two countries in this region are not and will not be coincident on very important matters. And this is perfectly natural. Moscow cannot be merely Washington's assistant in the Near and Middle East. At the official level our country's actions in respect of the crisis are as yet being perceived with satisfaction in the majority of Arab countries. "The position of the Soviet Union at the Helsinki summit was effective. Moscow showed its importance and also the fact that the USSR remains a great power," Jordanian Prime Minister Mudar Badran, for example, declared. But at the public level things are more complex, particularly in connection with the activation of the Soviet role in the formulation and implementation of international sanctions against Baghdad. "The improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations has two disastrous consequences for the Arabs: We have lost an ally in the shape of the USSR and are left face to face with the imperialist forces headed by the United States." These words are being repeated frequently in conversations with local Arab intellectuals or ordinary people in the street.

"It is now a matter of indifference to us how the Soviet Union votes, for the Soviet leadership has, as it wished, destroyed the power of the country and handed it over to the imperialists as a third-rate state. The Kremlin is now undoubtedly undermining relations with the third world," the prominent journalist Tariq Masarwah, who was for many years known as a constant champion of relations with the Soviet Union, writes in Jordan's most popular newspaper AL-RA'Y.

Thus the Soviet Union's political positions in the Arab countries, as in a number of other states of the third world, are being put to a serious test. On the Arab salient this is connected primarily with the mass departure of Soviet Jews for the Near East.

There had been a marked perception of strain in the Arab countries' relations with the Soviet Union even prior to the tumultuous events in the Gulf region. Alarm and confusion even in connection with the news from Moscow were showing through in statements and appeals of Arab politicians and public figures and being heard in people's conversations on the streets of Damascus and Cairo, in comfortable divans (reception

rooms) of Kuwait and Abu Dhabi, and in the Palestinian neighborhoods in the Israeli-occupied territories. In the opinion of prominent Arab journalists, the changes which have encompassed the Soviet Union and East Europe are having a negative effect on Arab interests. Our support for the legitimate interests of the Arabs is allegedly being cut back, and the East European countries are turning their backs on the Arab world altogether in favor of Israel. The end of the "cold war," for which Arab politicians were not prepared, has disrupted Arab leaders' political strategy to a large extent. It is hard for the Arab public mentality to take in such phenomena in the USSR as our protracted repentance of sins and crimes of the past and the endless exposure of the malfeasance of former leaders. Even Arab communists are increasingly asking Soviet representatives: "Dear Comrades, when will you have done with your striptease and the daubing of your whole history with black paint?" It cannot be said that the Arab countries have not understood the need and justification for radical reforms in the Soviet Union and the adjustments of our foreign policy. A number of Arab states also are proclaiming a multiparty system and planning serious reforms. An increasingly wide range of Arab politicians realize that in the present rapidly changing world the Arab region runs the risk of finding itself in the backwoods of international life unless it radically changes itself.

But practically all political forces of the Arab countries and the Palestine national movement are taking with great distress the unprecedented expansion of the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel. The scale of the present wave of the Jewish exodus prompted Clovis Maqsd, spokesman for the Arab League in the United Nations, to declare: "Whereas 45 years ago the Arabs were victims of the crisis of Western civilization, which led to the seizure of power in Germany by the Nazis and the exodus of the Jews who were spared extermination to Palestine, we have now become the victims of the crisis of socialism."

"...Thousands of Soviet Jews have celebrated Passover in Israel for the first time. One thousand persons arrived in the last two pre-Passover days alone. The Israeli ballet has scaled new heights. New chess champions have emerged in Israel. New athletes are affording Israel reason to hope for success at the next Olympic games. Israel has never seen such a wave of immigrants—engineers, mathematicians, artists, astrophysicists." The arrival of new Israeli citizens was reported in such a joyous tone by B. Simon, correspondent of the American CBS. But the American journalist also saw possible problems this stream will cause: "Like any other wave of immigrants, the Jews who have come from the USSR will make Israel stronger. The question, however, is whether this new force will inspire Israel to move toward peace."

The Arab community and Arab politicians are worried all the more by the immediate and distant consequences of the powerful influx into Israel and the occupied Arab territories of immigrants from the Soviet Union (Jews

are not consumed with a desire to move to Israel from the developed Western countries, and immigration resources from other states are small also, except for the dark-skinned Falasha from Ethiopia). Were it not for the mass influx of Soviet Jews, in 20 years, by the year 2010, the Arab population of Israel and the occupied territories would be comparable in numbers with the Jewish population. Israelis would have to share political power with the Arabs, and the prevailing ideology in Israel of political Zionism providing for the mononational and monoreligious nature of this state would be deprived of a real basis. Observers in Arab and many other countries are noting that the considerable increase in immigration will strengthen the positions of right-wing and extremist forces in this country, which could in the future, in the event of an election victory, propel them toward a dangerous new adventure.

Practically all Palestinians whom I have met recently are convinced that the present extensive immigration will inevitably have a deleterious effect on the position of hundreds of thousands of Arab inhabitants of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and of the Arab minority in Israel proper. The land and water resources of historic Palestine are limited, and, in the opinion of Palestinians, no international pressure could prevent the Israeli authorities from expanding Jewish colonization of the occupied territories and squeezing the Arabs from the economic life of Israel itself. Jordan, onto whose territory many Palestinians could be "squeezed" from the West Bank and Gaza, as King Husayn fears, is finding itself under threat, and a very real one at that.

Palestinians are angered by the fact that the new immigrants, whose distant ancestors even most likely did not live in Palestine, obtain upon arrival every conceivable benefit and assistance, whereas the former Arab inhabitant of Haifa, for example, does not have the right even for a short length of time to come to Israel to look even at his ancestral home, which is now in the possession of newcomers from a distant country. Palestinian leader Yasir 'Arafat says: "We Palestinian exiles, who were born in Palestine and whose forefathers lived in this country for millennia, are not allowed to return to our homeland. But Soviet citizens, who have a homeland of their own and the majority of whom are obviously not descendants of the 12 tribes of Israel, are coming here and occupying our places with the help of American money. Is this just?"

The numerous Arab demands on the Soviet Union in connection with all these serious matters may be divided into manifestly unrealistic and those that might full well be taken into consideration. Public opinion in the Arab East as a whole believes that the Soviet representations on the question of Israel's unlawful actions pertaining to the settlement of the occupied territories have as yet been ineffective. The Arabs believe that the Soviet Union should have acted more decisively to prevent the settlement of Soviet Jews on territory which does not belong to Israel, including East Jerusalem and its suburbs, and should have been more insistent in demanding

from it the corresponding assurances on this score. They are asking that direct flights between Moscow and Israel not be inaugurated inasmuch as this would facilitate for Israel the task of keeping for itself all the immigrants, many of whom would like to live not in Israel but in a tranquil and prosperous Western country. They are requesting that the immigrants not be deprived of Soviet citizenship and that they be issued passports permitting them to return to the Soviet Union or to travel to a third country.

The often-repeated charges that the USSR is "helping" Israel, supplying it with human resources, are generally unfair in respect of our country, which has done much and continues to do much for the support of the just cause of the Palestinians and all Arabs. No, the rights of some people cannot be realized at the expense of those of other people and whole nations. UN General Assembly Resolution No. 194 of 11 December 1948 is coming to be mentioned increasingly frequently in this connection. Adopted in the course of the first Arab-Israeli war, this resolution declared the right of Palestinian refugees to return to their native parts or to compensation for lost property for those who did not wish to return. This resolution was subsequently confirmed by the international organization many times over, but Israel did everything to ensure that it was not fulfilled. Implementation of this resolution was advocated by, among others, former U.S. President Jimmy Carter, who engaged in active peacemaking activity in the Near East. Why not link by international efforts the immigration of Jews to Israel with if only the partial return of Palestinian refugees to their native parts?

The standard Arab accusation against the Soviet Union to the effect that the present Jewish exodus from Moscow to Israel was coordinated with the U.S. Administration is devoid of any specific arguments. It happened that the U.S. Administration's measures pertaining to the regulation of the entry of immigrants and a reduction in quotas (Soviet Jews may lay claim to only 40,000 places a year) coincided with a steep rise in the number of Soviet Jews departing for Israel. There are many contradictions and confused circumstances in U.S. policy on all these matters, given an overall pro-Israel tendency. President Bush himself and other American officials and leaders of the Jewish community in the United States are constantly resorting to the most outright pressure in respect of Moscow, demanding the immediate removal of all obstacles and restrictions in respect of Jews' departure and the inauguration of direct regular flights to Israel. The Israel lobby is buttressing this pressure with threats to prevent repeal of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment and other discriminatory documents limiting Soviet-American economic cooperation.

On the other hand, concerns are increasing in respect of our policy in the Arab world. It is therefore very important that our country not allow itself to become involved in risky affairs on both the Palestinian and the "Gulf" flanks of the Near East arc of crisis. And the calls of certain Soviet journalists for our soldiers to be sent to

"pacify" the Iraqi ruler would seem odious here against the background of the Soviet leadership's devotion to peaceful and political methods of a solution of the crisis.

As if unduly rapid movement to accommodate American or Israeli wishes in respect of the Near East would not damage our good political capital accumulated in the Arab world. Certain authors are vainly accusing our diplomacy in this region of having "cultivated dictators." Local authoritarian rulers have become entrenched in the region by availing themselves in one way or another of the support of the most diverse international forces. Of course, Saddam Husayn is about 50 years late with his warlike march à la Bismarck for Arab political concert, when Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, Franco, Chang Kaishi, and dozens of the lesser dictators appeared simultaneously on the world scene. But perhaps he was just three or four years late, not having been in time to take advantage for his own ends of the last chords of the "cold war." Of course, the Iraqi leader was never a democrat, and his methods deserve to be condemned, but are we with our recent past all that suited to the role of preacher from the high rostrum, of democratic values in their Western version all the more? Of course, the Arab world also is moving toward democracy in this form or the other, and this process will also unfold in the Arab monarchies in the Gulf region following a solution of the crisis, but this will occur on local soil under the determining influence of local traditions and influences, primarily, the diverse influence of Islam.

We have not put a single ruler in power in the Arab countries or supported him with bayonets. Our capital in the Near East is not thousands of tanks but unique dams on the Nile and Euphrates, plants, schools, and hospitals built with Soviet participation.

Hopes that all might in the Near East return to as it was on 2 August 1990 would seem naive. Given any outcome of the crisis, neither Kuwait nor other Arab countries of the Gulf, whose internal weakness caused primarily by the abstention of the local element of the population from participation in production and services and the inordinate orientation toward the West has been manifested so graphically following the Iraqi assault, will ever return to the status quo ante. But whatever happens in the Gulf region and whatever the settlement of the crisis in this region, there will be no peace or a peaceful life for anyone in the Near East without a just solution of the Palestinian problem. The majority of countries of the world have rejected Saddam Husayn's crude linkage of his withdrawal from Kuwait with Israel's withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories. One cannot occupy one's weak neighbor under the slogan of the elimination of another occupation. But the Palestinian question has been and will continue to be most closely linked with all that is happening in the Near East. If it is not possible in practice to put an end to both occupations simultaneously, the Arab-Israeli conflict should be settled immediately following the solution of the conflict in the Gulf. Otherwise the world will continue to be on the edge of the Near East abyss.

War Seen as Inevitable*PM0611094190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4*

[Yu. Glukhov commentary: "Persian Gulf: 'Tomorrow Was War'"]

[Text] With increasing frequency a war in the Persian Gulf area is being talked and written about as a fait accompli, almost in the past tense. All the same, is it really possible that "tomorrow was war"? Have the military and the politicians and world public opinion really gotten used to the idea of the next catastrophe?

The consequences of an armed conflict in the Near and Middle East could really be catastrophic. The world press is painting them in apocalyptic colors. They are predicting that U.S. losses alone will be greater than during the Vietnam War. The inevitable oil-field conflagrations will not only lead to an oil crisis but will also be an ecological disaster for the whole planet. The impending threat of the use of chemical and even nuclear weapons clouds still further the prospects of the conflict's development. The bottom line is that everyone will be the loser.

How important in this situation are the peacemaking efforts and searches for a political settlement on the basis of UN Security Council resolutions! And how strange that they are so often greeted by a skeptical and negative attitude. Former British Premier E. Heath's trip to Baghdad and the forthcoming visit there of W. Brandt, chairman of the German Social Democratic Party, are being criticized.

Attempts are also being made to cast a shadow of doubt over the mission of Ye.M. Primakov, the USSR president's special representative. Some people parrot about its "futility." Others parrot about connivance with an aggressor. And others, for whom a strike against Iraq is an end in itself, are simply fueling passions. It is surprising that certain Soviet information organs trot out the cliches from preconceived assessments without troubling to make their own analysis either from the viewpoint of common sense or on the basis of their own country's interests.

By putting out the diplomatic feelers, however, the Soviet Union is not conducting a behind-the-scenes game. It is not contemplating weakening the front opposing the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait. This has been plainly and clearly stated at the highest level. We are talking about using all means to prevent bloodshed.

That is why the Soviet representative's "shuttle diplomacy" was assessed, for instance, in Riyadh (and not only there) as "Moscow's efforts aimed at preventing a military confrontation because of the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait" and "guaranteeing the implementation of resolutions approved by the world community." In the electrified, explosive situation it is exceptionally important to preserve the thread of contacts, the thread of dialogue. Which is what the Soviet Union is doing.

Of course, Soviet diplomacy's prime task is to ensure the safety of our countrymen working in Iraq, their life and well-being, and also to prevent the USSR being dragged into an Afghanistan-type situation. This aim alone justifies any "shuttle diplomacy."

As regards the trip's specific results, I will cite a personal interview with Primakov. He said that an analysis carried out testifies to shifts in Baghdad's position.

That means that the search for a political solution to the conflict could and should be continued. The more so in conditions whereby the means of putting economic pressure on the aggressor have been far from used up. Let me recall that ahead of us lie U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's trip to the Near East and his meeting with USSR Foreign Minister E. Shevardnadze. We will hope that new diplomatic actions lie ahead. It would be strange to suppose, although such suppositions are being expressed, that the U.S. foreign policy department chief's efforts will be reduced to preparation for war.

Nor has the Arab settlement factor been exhausted. USSR President M.S. Gorbachev has spoken about this.

Arab diplomacy's notorious apathy in relation to the development of the Iraq-Kuwait conflict is incomprehensible to me personally. Meanwhile, unexpected and bold turns have been observed in the prolonged Arab-Israeli confrontation. What has happened, for instance, is that Israel got out of Egypt by quitting the Sinai peninsula, and has withdrawn from part of the Syrian Golan Heights and from almost all occupied Lebanese territory. Are the differences between Iraq and Kuwait really greater than those between the Arabs and Israel? Have all chances of a peaceful settlement really been utilized?

Poll Notes Public Opinion on Gulf Events*PM0111163390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2*

[INTERFAX report: "Soviet People Perceive Saddam Husayn Without Particular Emotion"]

[Text] During the period 5-17 September this year the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion conducted a poll among an all-Union representative selection of 1,356 people from 21 population centers in 11 regions of the Soviet Union. The questions included one on Iraqi President Saddam Husayn, who has recently been shown frequently on television in connection with the crisis in the Persian Gulf. The question was formulated as follows: "What feelings does this person arouse in you personally?" Husayn "arouses no particular feelings" in an overwhelming number of those who replied (64 percent), although on the whole this political figure arouses a negative attitude (24 percent) or fear (four percent) more frequently than respect (five percent), liking (three percent), or admiration (one percent).

Sub-Saharan Africa

TASS Previews Angolan Peace Talks in Lisbon

LD0511143590 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT
5 Nov 90

[By TASS political analyst Gennadiy Petrov]

[Text] Moscow November 5 TASS—Will this year bring peace to war ravaged Angola? Great hopes are being pinned on the fifth round of talks between representatives of the Angolan Government and the UNITA [National Union for Total Independence of Angola] rebels scheduled to begin in Lisbon in the next few days. The talks are being held with Portugal's mediation and with the participation of Soviet and American experts.

The ceasefire was the main stumbling block during the previous rounds, since UNITA wants it to be recognised as a legitimate political force [sentence as received]. The Angola Government has refused to meet this demand since, it argues, the country has a constitutionally endorsed one-party political system.

Political principles [word indistinct] by Portuguese diplomats, as well as military problems, including a ceasefire and establishment of a single national army prior to general elections, are expected to be the focus of the talks.

The extraordinary plenum of the Central Committee of the MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola] Labour Party, held at the end of October, was an important landmark in this light. President Jose Eduardo Dos Santos told the plenum that if the constitution was to be amended, a multi-party system could be introduced in Angola in the first quarter of 1991.

The special amendment passed by the U.S. Congress to end American military aid to UNITA if the Soviet Union stopped military deliveries to the Angolan Government and withdrew its military advisers from that country is a step in the same direction.

All this prompts a definite measure of optimism. It is possible that this dangerous seat of tension, a hangover of the cold war, will now be eliminated as East-West relations improve. This optimism is primarily engendered by the present desire of the belligerents to find a mutually acceptable settlement.

At the same time, it is clear that there are still quite a few difficulties ahead. UNITA leader Jonas Savimbi, who recently visited Washington, believes hostilities in Angola may continue until the end of this year. He praised the role played by the USSR and the United States in undoing the "Angolan knot".

At the same time, Savimbi claimed the peace process could be undermined if Washington failed to give his movement additional aid, estimated by some experts at \$60 million a year.

Angolan authorities believe this aid, rendered through CIA channels, tends to escalate military actions and thereby increases the number of casualties, including among the peaceful population.

Complications Seen in Ethiopia, Sudan Relief

EA3010203690 Moscow International Service
in Amharic 1500 GMT 27 Oct 90

[From the "Africa as We See It" program]

[Text] We have recently received worrying and sad reports from East Africa about a drought threatening millions of people in Ethiopia and Sudan. As was the case last year, the amount of rainfall this year is worrying.

During the World Vision International Conference in Addis Ababa on 23 October, the Ethiopian relief and rehabilitation commissioner, Yilma Kasaye, told the participants that severe food shortages would occur in Tigray, Welo, Harerge, and other parts of the country next year. It is accordingly clear that Ethiopia will again need massive international food aid and the means of transporting it for distribution. It is also relevant to indicate here that the issue has a political nature. It is common knowledge that the drought-hit areas are battlefields of the civil war, and it is not difficult to understand that war exacerbates the drought situation. The issue of food distribution to drought victims has always been a political one.

Arguments have been going on for a year over opening Ethiopia's biggest port, Mitsuwa, to receive the food aid. During this period the Ethiopian Government and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPLF] have time and again radically changed their attitudes. Since February, Mitsuwa has been in the hands of the secessionists. Now, Ethiopia is calling on the secessionists to open Mitsuwa to receive food aid.

The EPLF leaders, who had earlier demanded that food aid should pass through Mitsuwa, have now changed their minds. Their original stance was adopted so that their movement could be directly or indirectly recognized by the international agencies who contact them. The varying views expressed by the two conflicting parties concern the procedure on docking ships, but inasmuch as the distribution of food is a matter of life and death for millions of Ethiopians, it is very relevant. For this reason, issues of political differences, power, and ambitions for recognition should be set aside in favor of taking responsibility for the survival of compatriots. There is no doubt about this.

The situation in neighboring Sudan is also alarming. It is no better than in Ethiopia. The World Food Program [WFP] recently announced it had sent 19,000 tonnes of food to Sudan, but since Sudan needs a total of a million tonnes the amount sent by the WFP falls far short of what is required. In the view of UN experts, the situation in Sudan today is similar to that in the mid-1980s. At

that time about 250,000 Sudanese starved to death due to drought. The problem is further exacerbated by the civil war in the country. As in neighboring Ethiopia, saving the lives of the drought victims should be the main political issue here.

Problems Follow Cease-Fire in Rwanda

Situation Compared to Liberia

*EA3010221290 Moscow International Service
in Somali 1600 GMT 29 Oct 90*

[Vladimir Shilov commentary]

[Text] It is now becoming evident that the cease-fire declared by the Rwandan Government on 28 October is unlikely to succeed. Although the cease-fire was observed by the rebels of the Rwanda National Patriotic Front, it only lasted a day.

According to a Rwandan Government spokesman, the rebels attacked government positions on 25 October with the loss of 10 fighters. On 26 October, further attacks were made on government troops in Nyagatare and Kabarore near the Katigumba River, which marks the border between Uganda and Rwanda. Diplomatic sources quoted by AFP blame government troops for violating the cease-fire. Since the fighting broke out, the government has recruited over 3,000 soldiers, a number which is set to rise to 10,000, which should make it possible to drive the invaders out of Rwanda. Events in Rwanda now resemble Liberia. Thousands have fled from the war zone, most of them to Uganda. Last week there were as many as 12,000 refugees. They were not expected and as a result many problems have emerged, for they need food, medication, and shelter. Epidemics could easily break out.

The African countries which met in Gbadolite last week agreed to send a fact-finding mission to northeastern Rwanda where the fighting is taking place. The mission was to comprise delegates from Uganda, Burundi, and Zaire, and representatives from the Rwandan Government and the rebels. The current OAU chairman, who is Uganda's head of state, was entrusted with forming an African peacekeeping force to oversee the enforcement of the cease-fire. Is this not exactly what is happening in Liberia? Belgian Prime Minister Martens, while visiting Rome, disclosed that he had received a letter from the OAU secretary general, Salim Ahmed Salim, calling on the EEC to assist in forming the African peacekeeping force to be deployed in Rwanda. Martens invited France, Germany, and the Netherlands to participate in this indispensable assistance financially and technically. Despite the presence of an African peacekeeping force in Liberia, there is still no peace in that country.

Refugee Problem Remains

*EA0311182890 Moscow International Service
in Somali 1600 2 Nov 90*

[Aleksey Leontyev commentary]

[Text] Juvenal Habyarimana, the president of Rwanda, speaking on the national radio yesterday, stated that the war which started in October had ended. He said: the enemy has been routed from our land. Our commentator, Aleksey Leontyev, says that according to independent news sources over the past few days the Rwandese forces liberated from the guerrillas the districts they had captured, including Kagitumba on the border between Rwanda and Uganda. Commentators believe that a relatively minor group of 800 guerrillas now remains in the Akagera National Park, but such a group cannot pose a threat to the government troops. Moreover, Belgium, Rwanda's former colonizer, has stated that it is withdrawing its paratrooper units, reinforced after being attacked by the guerrillas, from Rwanda.

International news agencies reported yesterday that many jubilant people came out into the streets of Kigali, the Rwandan capital, to celebrate the end of the military conflict, but the question remains: has the cause of the clash been resolved? I wish to remind you that the guerrillas from Uganda belong to the Tutsi tribe, which is Rwanda's minority in relation to the Hutu tribe. An ugly confrontation 30 years ago forced hundreds of thousands of the Tutsi tribe to go into exile to save their lives. Over two million Rwandan refugees, mostly from the Tutsi tribe, now live in other countries. It is a fact that they are now seeking to return to their motherland by any means.

These people have a case, but the means they used in October are unacceptable. Moreover, the events in Rwanda have exacerbated the problem of the Rwandan refugees. How can it be solved? Many politicians believe that holding multilateral talks is indispensable. This is the aim of the plan laid down by the countries mediating in the conflict. Juvenal Habyarimana believes it is now possible to call a regional conference to be attended by several European countries. Such a conference is now planned, but it will be necessary to agree on when it should start. Kigali believes that many things depend on the position of Uganda, which, according to the Rwandan Government, backed the guerrillas. Habyarimana has openly stated that the governments of the world must force Yoweri Museveni to put a block on any possible repeat attack on Rwanda by guerrillas in Uganda. The Ugandan leader has replied to the accusations levelled against him. The forthcoming talks will therefore be difficult but important. That is because, apart from the immediate political issues, other important ones remain, adds our commentator Leontyev.

Reports View, Assess Somali Government's Crisis

Opposition Poses 'Threat'

*EA2610200490 Moscow International Service
in Somali 1600 GMT 25 Oct 90*

[Vladimir Borisov commentary from the "World Events Today" program]

[Text] Three were killed and over 30 injured in the 23 October confrontation between police and demonstrators in Mogadishu. Our commentator, Vladimir Borisov, comments:

Hundreds were participating in a demonstration calling for the release of political detainees when the police fired on them. The organizers of the demonstration, whom the government calls troublemakers, were appealing to the people to mark 23 October as political detainees' day. The Somali masses are enraged by the government's refusal to release those detained by the Somali National Security Court. The new constitution, which came into effect on 12 October 1990, abolished the court.

Mogadishu, one of the few places controlled by the Siad Barre regime, is entering a new era of chaos. These latest demonstrations and their repercussions constitute clear evidence that the country is in total chaos. The question is: What will be the outcome of all this chaos?

Last week was the 21st anniversary of Siad's coming to power. The three major rebel groups issued a joint communique announcing the merger of their forces to overthrow the government. They stressed there could be no dialogue with the Siad Barre regime. This communique cast a dark shadow over the government's efforts to hold talks with the rebels. The rebel groups have not yet announced any tangible political program. They are nothing but tribal armed rebels, who in no way could be called a political opposition. The continuing armed struggle is a struggle for power, which places a question mark on the rebel leadership's ability to achieve full unity.

However, it is an undeniable fact that the military merger of the rebel groups constitutes a threat to the regime. The rebel groups have realized that their disunity helped the regime to cling to power, despite the chaotic situation, but even if the government is toppled by the joint rebel military forces, this does not mean that the civil war blazing in Somalia will end. The civil war will simply blaze further.

Somalia might follow in the footsteps of Liberia, but the latest events in Mogadishu also show that Somalia's destiny might take a different course. Muslim fundamentalists have unexpectedly appeared in political life. They are opposed to the new constitution, which provides for forming many parties and freedom of expression. The Muslim fundamentalists have condemned the government for adopting a European-style constitution, arguing that only Islamic law can salvage the country from chaos. In the context of the prevailing crisis, the Muslim fundamentalists appear to be working to bring about the downfall of the government.

Envoy Notes Reconciliation Efforts

*EA0311184290 Moscow International Service
in Somali 1600 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Text] Somalia brought a new constitution into effect on 12 October providing for the political opposition to form

their own parties. To enlighten us on the current situation in Somalia, we interviewed Mr. Abdullahi Egal Nur, the Somali ambassador in Moscow.

The ambassador said that unless there is a national reconciliation, neither elections nor a national referendum can be held. Both have been postponed by the Somali Government due to the political situation in the country. Every step has been taken to ensure that all social and political forces can participate in the country's political life. The Somali Government is planning to pass new laws to govern referendums, elections, multiparties, and press freedom. These laws are to enable every citizen to participate in running the day-to-day affairs of the nation and we, therefore, hope the opposition will play its part in enforcing these laws. We also hope the opposition will attend roundtable peace negotiations inasmuch as the government has already started democratizing society and calling for national reconciliation for lasting peace. Laws have also been amended and the opposition therefore has no reason for hesitating to participate in the national election and in the country's political life.

It is true that the country has political problems. The armed opposition is waging hit-and-run warfare in the country. To bring this to an end the Somali Government has made and continues to make tremendous efforts to bring about national reconciliation. We hope these efforts will bear fruit even if the government and the rebels do not hold direct peace negotiations due to the absence of a third party acceptable to ourselves and the rebels to mediate.

It is worth mentioning that the Somali Government has raised no preconditions for such peace negotiations. It has told the rebels to choose when and where the peace talks could be held. Despite this generous offer, the rebels have not responded to the government and mediation proposals. This is clear evidence of their lack of policy.

Turning to the country's economy, the ambassador said that the country is one of the developing countries whose export earnings are shrinking and which is affected by growing debt burdens and lack of technological skills. The country's leadership has taken steps toward finding solutions to these problems, but these steps can only bear fruit if international financial support is secured. We hope international financial institutions like the World Bank will grant us economic help. Now that the country has adopted a new constitution guaranteeing the establishment of many parties, cooperation between Somalia and these institutions will be strengthened. There must be a total political and economic transformation in Somalia and then it would be possible for the country's economy to be resuscitated. The country is endowed with abundant natural resources which could attract foreign investment. Everyone who wants to invest in our economy will very soon be able to do so. The government is hoping to get its people's help to enable it to raise the deteriorating standards of living.

Referring to the Somali students in the USSR, the ambassador said they should take their studies seriously. It is not possible for every student to achieve a high educational standard, but many of them have succeeded in their studies. Student life in the USSR is not easy, because the allowances students receive are inadequate and this is why we sometimes give students further assistance. In terms of education, the USSR has the best facilities and many Somali students have graduated from Soviet institutions. Many Somali students who have graduated in medicine, construction, and engineering are performing important roles in Somalia.

Kompletkov Receives Namibian Envoy's Letter

LD0211142390 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 2 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Komplektov today received Charge d'Affaires of the Republic of Namibia in the USSR N. Amagula, who conveyed to him a letter of recommendation from his country's foreign minister.

During a warm and friendly talk, the sides expressed the mutual intention to develop comprehensive and constructive relations between the two countries.

East Europe

Moscow To Supply Oil, Pay Off Debts to Yugoslavia

LD0211194490 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1319 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Excerpts] Moscow, 2 Nov (TANJUG)—The USSR has made a firm promise that by the end of the year it will deliver to Yugoslavia this year's quota of six million tonnes of oil and two million tonnes of diesel oil and oil derivatives. The promise was made to an Federal Executive Council [FEC] delegation led by Aleksandar Mitrovic, vice president of the FEC, which today ends its several-day visit to the USSR. [passage omitted]

The volume of cooperation with the USSR next year should be about \$4 billion, which represents a decrease by approximately one third. This is explained by the fact that many Soviet republics which have proclaimed state and economic sovereignty are trying, in their trade with foreign countries, to avoid the central organs and establish direct cooperation.

The Soviet side has obliged itself to pay off its debts to Yugoslavia within a three-year period. This relates to loans of \$670 million, and trade debts of \$1.3 billion.

Problems Continue With Troops Leaving Hungary

LD02111205290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 2 November, in its "Vremya" newscast, airs a two-minute Ye. Shirokov video report

from Hungary, which was inaudible in part, on a meeting between journalists and the South Group of Soviet Forces.

The opening video sequences shows trains loaded with Soviet troops and military equipment at the Hungarian border. Shirokov says troop trains are crossing the border by day and night. "To date exactly half of the troops and military equipment have been redeployed to new locations."

At the meeting of the press with the Southern Group of Forces it was stated that Soviet forces have been allowed through everywhere without hindrance. The timetable has been fully adhered to.

There are, however, still unresolved problems; they include the local sale of 125,000 tonnes of material and technical supplies, which are due by agreement to be acquired by the Hungarian side. There is also the question of payment for the houses and installations that are being vacated. Previous military cantonments now stand empty in 23 Hungarian towns and settlements.

Shirokov reports there have been cases of defilement of monuments to Soviet forces at many locations vacated by garrisons. These acts of vandalism are frequently not being resisted by the local authorities. A Hungarian defense Ministry spokesman deeply regretted that such acts had occurred.

The accompanying video shows the meeting of journalists and military men of the Southern Group of forces and pictures of defiled Soviet monuments.

Polish Prime Minister Favors Developing Relations

LD0511070490 Moscow TASS in English 0653 GMT 5 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Valentin Volkov]

[Text] Warsaw November 5 TASS—If Poland becomes a stable state, and it will be able to play an important role in a new European structure, said Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki speaking in Szczecin on Sunday at a meeting with members of local government.

The present Polish situation in Europe is determined by its position between the powerful Germany and the Soviet Union which is now making sweeping changes, he noted.

The geographical position has created threats for the country, although it may be used to create a long-term policy of reconciliation between nations.

It is necessary to do away with the continent's division into "Europe A" for the rich and "Europe B" for the poor over the next decade, he continued. If this division persists, it will be unfavourable both for Poland and Europe.

Poland should open its borders to capital from all countries.

Asked about Soviet troops in Poland, Mazowiecki said that they are to be withdrawn by the end of 1991. He favoured the development of relations with Germany at all levels, noting that the German minority in Poland should not enjoy special privileges. They should have the same rights as other national minorities enjoy.

Economic Accord With Czechoslovakia Proposed

*AU3110192290 Prague HOSPODARSKE NOVINY
in Czech 26 Oct 90 pp 1, 4*

[Unattributed report: "On Future Relations Between the USSR and the CSFR"]

[Text] The participants in a two-day seminar called "USSR-CSFR: The Prospects for Mutual Relations," which began in Moscow on Wednesday [24 October], yesterday devoted themselves to discussing economic cooperation and both countries' attitudes toward topical international problems.

Once again the dialogue centered—among other things—around the problem of mutually settling accounts in foreign trade. Both sides referred to the fact that it is necessary to find ways of maintaining existing commercial relations under the conditions of the conversion to world prices and a freely convertible currency. The Soviet side expressed the opinion that not only is the CSFR dependent on the USSR as its main supplier of power industry and other raw materials, but the Soviet Union also urgently requires Czechoslovak products, for example, cars and trucks.

The well known economists Nikolay Shmelyov and Oleg Bogomolov suggested that possibilities be sought for renewing clearing agreements with the balance being paid in freely convertible currency. This is not an ideal form, stated Shmelyov, but it is a necessary one. He is of the opinion that the introduction of world prices and payments in free currencies would be more a symbolic than a truly effective measure and that both economies could pay dearly for it. Therefore, it is necessary to seek an opportunity to temporarily avoid this; life itself necessitates it.

Attention was focused on the problems of the Warsaw Pact and CEMA in a discussion on the foreign and political aspects of relations. For example, Yuriy Davydov, head of a department at the USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute, stated that the preservation of the Warsaw Pact depends—to a certain extent—on Soviet-Czechoslovak relations because the GDR has ceased to exist, Hungary has already decided, and Poland is hesitating. He cast doubts upon all the possible roles which the Warsaw Pact could play in present day Europe and came to the conclusion that it is essential for the USSR.

Igor Orlik, head of a department at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute for International Economic and Political Research, suggested that a declaration be signed on cooperation between the USSR and the CSFR. It

would declare previous policy to be erroneous, it would contain an apology from the USSR for 1968, and—first and foremost—it would orient mutual relations toward the future. It would compensate, for a specific period, for the new interstate treaty whose preparation will demand a great deal of time. He described the old 1970 treaty as an "ideologized document which is saturated with the endeavor to maintain something that has not existed for a long time."

The CSFR delegation headed by First Deputy Foreign Minister Robert Harencar is composed of three dozen leading Czechoslovak politicians, economists, and political scientists—including presidential advisers Richard Wagner and Petr Oslizly. Apart from the above-mentioned people, USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V. Petrovskiy was among those present on the Soviet side yesterday.

USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze received the participants in the Soviet-Czechoslovak seminar in Moscow on Wednesday. In an extraordinarily open discussion with the leading Czechoslovak politicians and economists—a discussion which lasted two-and-a-half hours—he exchanged views on the current state and future of relations between both countries focusing most attention on the economy.

Shevardnadze emphasized that a fundamental change in relations between the USSR and the CSFR, especially in the economy, is essential. In this regard, he put forward several proposals, first and foremost, for the preparation and signing of a new general treaty between both states which would be followed up by specialized agreements for individual spheres of cooperation. He also announced that, during the course of a month or two, the USSR should draft the principles for the republics' foreign relations. He suggested that a joint commission composed of experts in various fields and independent of governments be established to look for a way out of the current situation which he described as being in crisis. He also announced that the postponed session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee in Budapest should, in the USSR's opinion, deal mainly with economic relations.

During the discussion, members of the Czechoslovak delegation referred to the depressing state of economic relations and, among other things, to the Soviet Union's nonfulfillment of oil supply agreements which is also having a negative impact on the political sphere. Eduard Shevardnadze said that Czechoslovak reservations are justified because the Soviet Union is not complying with the various obligations it undertook in the past. Oil production in the USSR will be reduced by 50 million tonnes, and perhaps more, this year. However, the reasons for this are overwhelmingly objective ones. According to the minister, it is not necessary to dramatize the situation; the situation is dramatic enough on its own.

The minister considered the fact that in the background of the processes underway in both countries, the significance of bilateral relations has recently been underestimated to a certain extent. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify starting points and to initiate a debate on "generally amending" these starting points.

In a debate on the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Czechoslovakia, Michael Kocab described the sensitivity with which both sides are approaching this matter and the close cooperation between the parliamentary committee which he heads and the leadership of the Central Group of Soviet Forces. E. Shevardnadze expressed his gratitude for the stance adopted by the Czechoslovak authorities and people who "have reasons for behaving differently."

Border Conflict, 'Customs War' With Poland Viewed
91UF0088A Moscow *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA*
in Russian 20 Oct p 3

[Article by A. Oskin: "Why the 'Border of Friendship' Is Sullen"]

[Text] A customs war that does not and cannot have victors is underway.

The state border of the USSR between our country and Poland was called the "border of friendship" for a very long time. I believe that such a nickname is no longer appropriate. Perhaps it is time to think up a new designation—if it is necessary. While I do not aspire to the final word on the subject, I would like to take the occasion to reflect.

It is hard for me to write and think about it, but the Soviet authorities, through the words and actions of their bureaucrats, have done so much that is, to put it mildly, hasty and inconsistent on our western borders, that I sometimes wonder where the anti-Soviet forces are hiding themselves in the final analysis? Is it really in Texas, as is always implied?

We all recall how, several months ago at the very beginning of the tourist season, huge lines appeared on both sides of the border at automobile crossing points. The Soviet customs barrier slammed closed on an otherwise healthy stream of travelers and businessmen. Buses with children and private automobiles such as the little "Zhiguli," the "Polonez," and the "Mercedes" with diplomatic plates formed lines stretching seven to nine kilometers. People in cars went several days without water, normal food, and the necessary sanitary facilities waiting for the happy—although sometimes humiliating according to the procedure of the moment—meeting with Soviet officials at the State (in capital letters!) Border. Our enterprising fellow countrymen on the territory of Poland organized their own half-illegal self-government, "kept order" in the line, and excellently punished the unruly: They smashed windshields into dust, toppled cars into ditches, and got into fist fights. And what fist fights! Instances of fatal injuries were

registered. The Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent a note of protest, and the Soviet embassy in Warsaw began to sound the alarm. The border restrictions were eased somewhat, and the lines were reduced. You should have seen the commentaries on this in the Polish newspapers and hear the statements of the officials. However, those who were guilty of the June Soviet-Polish border crisis were never located. Perhaps it is because, as noted previously, only a few individuals made the high political decisions and never bore the responsibility for the specific way they were implemented, while others, on the contrary, justified their actions by citing directives "from on high."

More about that below. Right now I would like to recall an opinion popular about two years ago to the effect that the Poles carry out too many Soviet color televisions and other goods, and as a result they are disappearing from our stores. Reports from the border of wagons and automobiles with television boxes were supposed to be visual confirmation of the hypothesis. However, this was stretching things a bit. At that time we were producing about 10 million televisions a year. Specialists calculated at that time no more than 500,000 televisions crossed the western border of the USSR in the course of a year. One Japanese journalist even joked that our televisions are of such low quality that those who buy them should be rewarded and thanked for transporting them abroad for free. Of course it is only a joke to him.... As a result, the administration made a harsh decision: To forbid people to carry color televisions, in addition to a long list of other goods, across the Soviet-Polish border. This was to keep our neighbors from fleecing the Soviet citizen. The customs service, quickly demonstrating exceptional patriotism, joined the struggle for the welfare of the Soviet consumer. In the meantime the Polish authorities, understandably, also introduced several restrictions. After all, Poland too has its share of "patriots" who are not hampered by a knowledge of economics, social psychology, and simple common sense. ... And the Warsaw newspapers more or less blessed all these escalations in the customs war. (I will note with regret that this war is still in progress.)

But the "responsible departments" on the Soviet side did not consider the long term. They reacted almost instantaneously to the increasing problems with food goods in our country. And the verdict was that after the beginning of this year no goods worth more than five rubles [R] could be transported across the border. Imagine how much operating room this gives an official at this same border. He visually estimates the cost of the shopping bag, he separates out everything that exceeds the magic R5, he makes a list of the extras, and then—he confiscates them. And what if you are going on a training trip for six months and have something from your grandmother tucked away? And in general, what happens in this instance with a person's rights, never mind his continually demanding stomach?

I wish to be understood correctly. I am not opposed to customs restrictions. I am opposed to the thoughtless

prohibitory policy which, as we for some reason suppose, is the most effective. Each person should have the right to carry anything he wishes. Except for illegal drugs and other items that are dangerous to society. It is possible to establish a duty of 100 percent, for example, of the cost on those same televisions or irons, and let those who care to pay the duty to carry their goods through. If they will not pay, forbid the entry of the goods. Enterprising people have contrived to purchase sales slips from second-hand stores, bring the televisions through in a disassembled state, etc., because, as everyone knows, necessity is the mother of invention.... But what will be the end of all this?

...Recently the Warsaw markets, streets, and squares have filled up with Soviet tourists. There is the impression that anything can be purchased. What abundance there is here! No "closed section" in a department store even during the period of stagnation had such a holiday assortment of goods. In Warsaw at the Rozycki market (something like the Riga market in Moscow), whole "Russians rows" have come into being as well. On 4 September I read in *VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA* that at this market Soviet, Bulgarian, Romanian, and other amateur merchants united in a powerful syndicate to defend themselves against a local pack of swindlers that had sprung up and, having united, immediately turned into a real threat for the Polish guardians of order. Yes, you are right to ask where the Soviet speculator is getting his goods for trade if there is such a strict regimen at the State Border. How does he manage to carry through this whole mass of high-demand goods? It turns out that everything is laughably simple inasmuch as that very same thoughtless and highly decisive prohibition creates literally heavenly conditions for abuse. I do not by any means wish to offend the entire army of Soviet customs officials. I personally know notable, highly honorable people among them. But if they exist, then some scoundrels also exist. Poles have told me that it now costs R1,000 for a bus full of tourists to leave our country. An official in uniform steps into the waiting room, elegantly accepts an envelope (or R25 from a single tourist), and the road to Poland is open without any examination. That is, it is open for illegal barter. The Polish consumer receives high-quality and relatively cheap goods stamped "Made in the USSR," and a bus drives into our country with suitcases of Polish goods in great demand. As a result, someone in our country is lucky enough to pick up a pair of Polish jeans, a videotape recorder, contraceptives, or hypodermic syringes. In the end everyone wins but the state.

It is long overdue to end all these senseless prohibitory, administrative tactics. People must be given freedom, including the freedom to bring in goods from abroad and sell them without obstacles. If they really wish, the state, large enterprises, and departments should fight private trade using only economic measures. In the interests of all of society from the point of view of common sense, we need to create a network of stores that will sell on commission for foreigners and stimulate—yes, stimulate!—the import into the country of a maximum

volume of goods and foods by all possible means. And this also means import in suitcases and briefcases. In sensible countries, customs barriers are only raised to prevent goods from getting onto the market that compete with domestic brands. According to this indisputable logic, there are only two items which should be forbidden access to the USSR—empty store shelves and... fools with an enthusiasm for prohibitions.

If this were the case, the responsibilities of the customs service would decrease significantly. And reasonable customs duties, directed in part at providing new equipment to this department suffering from humiliating poverty and at providing a dignified wage to its workers would soon resolve many of its internal problems, including the problem of bribery.

There is another myth: That the border should be under lock and key. In the whole world the quantity of barbed wire dividing states is dwindling. In our country I believe that the tendency is the reverse: To strengthen, build, and fortify—with the goal of forbidding passage. We are not even fulfilling intergovernmental accords on opening additional automobile crossing points at the Soviet-Polish border! And the "responsible departments" do not wish to think about removing restrictions or weakening the passport regimen in any fashion. In any case, our repeated appeals from Warsaw (I had the opportunity to work here in the Soviet embassy for five years) on this subject were ignored by the respected departments for a long time. And now, something unexpected. Within the framework of a general liberalization, the government has adopted a rule to simplify the procedure for taking a trip abroad. It is possible to travel, for example, to Poland using the usual Soviet passport with an insert. And thus, it seems, there is the suggestion of an analogy to the famous cry of the Russian intelligentsia at the tsar's manifesto of 17 October of 1905—"We are free, gentlemen!" But there is no analogy. Unfortunately, history, even on a qualitatively new level, is not repeating itself.

Would the tsar's ministers have thought up tricks with inserts, R5-restrictions on goods, three-day lines at the crossing point, etc.? A noble decision, backed up by nothing, clashed with reality and succumbed. And as a result they decided to abolish any indulgences on the border....

Now a law on entry and exit is being prepared. In the opinion of the experts of the Directorate of Visas and Registration of Foreigners [UVIR], it will cost the treasury R10 billion. The number of personnel of that department must be increased by an additional 3,500 people. Never mind 10 million hard-currency rubles which are needed for the preparation of foreign passports. All this is undoubtedly true. But you and I are again being fed on empty declarations. We are not prepared for open civilized contacts with foreign countries economically (because of increased expenses), technically (the border points are not equipped properly) or morally and politically (after all, they are speculating!).

Consequently, we must again wait for a brighter future. It is almost the same as with pantyhose....

The solution is simple. Give the people more freedoms. And if you are going to speak about the Soviet-Polish border, then it is advisable to send a couple of bulldozers there to smooth the dirt roads across the cordon. Then put two polite and competent specialist next to each road. These are all the technical decisions that should be made. The Polish side manages with two border guards on a whole passenger train! But we are obliged to have a platoon on the inside and another on the outside....

The passports are even simpler. Permit passage out with a normal passport. The authors of this document, thank God, even provided the section "special notes," although it is true that room should be left for other purposes. We could revive the insert. Other resolutions are also possible.

I see angry frowns, but I still propose depriving the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] of its monopoly on registration of trips abroad. Why not hand over these rights to cooperatives and private bureaus? In Poland, for example, several dozen firms are involved in such mediatory services. But in our country, Stalin's principles still function: A trip abroad is a Political Act requiring a Political Decision. Fortunately it is not this way everywhere, and we can learn something from our neighbors. As opposed to us, civilized countries see great technical and financial difficulties in this.

There is one more myth concerning Soviet-Polish economic cooperation. Many Poles have tried to convince me that our economic ties are profitable only for the Soviet Union. However, our experts are convinced that we are losing millions of dollars to Poland every year. In any event, the transition on 1 January 1991 to settlements in hard currency at world prices should put everyone in his rightful place. We must hope that trade between our countries will finally be freed from political and ideological pressures. Perhaps the Soviet Union will take a fresh look at the problem of the Polish debt as well. Reality at the present looks depressing. This year an abrupt drop in commodity circulation is being observed. Less and less Soviet technology and equipment is reaching the Polish consumer. Increasingly fewer consumer goods produced by our neighbors are reaching Soviet stores. Western competitors are successfully squeezing us out of the Polish market. Polish enterprises are seeking more profitable sales opportunities in other parts of the world. Deliveries are falling. Intergovernmental agreements are not being concluded. Border trade, which was flourishing so recently, has practically been eliminated. Barter transactions have been prohibited. Direct, decentralized economic ties between many dozens of enterprises and organizations have been broken off. The contacts of incorporated cooperatives and firms have been complicated. The Polish market is full of consumer goods. But our statesmen will not let them through to our country.

It is absurd somehow. And the main thing is that I do not understand why it is this way: When a decision is made, a problem crops up. When instructions are given, we end up punishing ourselves. And what is more, no one is guilty. I propose that in the future the names of all officials and experts who sponsor a particular ruling of the Council of Ministers be published in the newspaper. And if a specific governmental measure or program fails, they should all immediately resign. A boundary should finally be proposed for the administrative excess that surrounds us, including that at the Soviet-Polish border!

I do not want to create the impression that everything is ideal on that side of the border, in Poland, by comparison with us, or that they have no officials there who are a match for our governmental geniuses. According to the press, recent public meetings there have increasingly often raised the question of so-called compensation to victims of Stalinist repressions or their families. A number of political leaders are trying, in view of present Polish realities, to get some additional capital out of this.

They are stating that all those who were interned in the thirties, subjected to persecutions in the following period, or forcibly resettled in Siberia and sent to forced labor should be paid monetary compensation. The press is circulating a figure of about R6 billion (the approximate sum of the Polish debt to our country). In addition, the assertion is being made that in the seventies and eighties Polish builders in the USSR were ruthlessly robbed, that they were underpaid many hundreds of rubles or dollars by comparison with world rates. So it is said that these citizens too should also be paid compensation....

I do not know who in Poland profits by this: Why should they wish to find a new point of contention in Soviet-Polish relations? But I do not see much truth to all these assertions. On the contrary. A clear desire to complicate our relations, which are already complex, is apparent. And anyway, who will pay compensation to Soviet people for their victims? There are more of them in the USSR than in Poland! Who will pay compensation to the families of 600,000 Soviet soldiers who died liberating Poland from Fascism?

Finally, some Soviet experts affirm that over the last 10 years alone we lost about \$30 million in Poland in deliveries of oil and other raw materials. By selling these commodities to the West at world prices, we would have had about \$3 million more each year. That would have come in very handy! Perhaps we should now raise the question of payment by the Poles of all those losses we suffered in that country.

Support for Soviet perestroika is expanding throughout the entire world. Even the tight-fisted West is concerned that Soviet reforms proceed. Why should Poland want to burden the half-starving Soviet country with an additional quintrent multiplied by political speculation? Stop, gentlemen, and let us continue to live as friends! The path of mutual claims and historical payment of debts is

the path to nowhere, to Stalinism, and to Pilsudskiy's legacy in their very worst manifestations.

There is a last thought I would like to mention. When the draft law on entry and exit is discussed in the USSR Supreme Soviet, I propose that our legislators look at it through the prism of the future. That is, they should look at it as though standing in a ruined vineyard and gazing at the year 1986 [as published]. In this instance I propose that we proceed from the perspective of the full elimination of borders in an all-European home, from the perspective of full freedom of personal decision for Soviet citizens with regard to leaving—independent of goal and length of the trip; and that we think about radical reforms with regard to abolishing outdated customs and border services. In short, I propose that we proceed from common sense and the experience of civilization. So that the border of friendship will be just that.

West Europe

Up to 30 KGB Agents Said Operating in Netherlands

AU0511141990 Paris AFP in English 1404 GMT
5 Nov 90

[Text] The Hague, Nov 5 (AFP)—As many as 30 KGB agents are operating in the Netherlands, according to Dutch counterintelligence officials, who called for all known Soviet spies to be expelled.

Between 25 and 30 KGB agents are working undercover as representatives for the Soviet airline Aeroflot, correspondents for the party daily PRAVDA, trade attaches or political secretaries at the embassy here, Onno Koerten, counterintelligence director at the BVD [Domestic Secret Service] state security, said at the weekend.

Mr. Koerten and BVD chief Arthur Docters van Leuwen were speaking in a television programme. They said about 100 Dutch nationals had contacts with Soviet spies, often without being aware of their real identity, and 25 were on Soviet payrolls. Spying activities generally focussed on advanced Western technology and sciences, they said.

An embassy spokesman said Soviet Ambassador Aleksandr Chivkaidze did not take the allegations seriously. The envoy was working "in an embassy and not a KGB office", he said.

Television also showed footage of an alleged KGB spy at work and the arrest, several years ago, of a spy for the East German Stasi secret service.

Mr. Koerten said the Soviet spying activities could not be tolerated. "You cannot say, let's pretend we get along fine while they are stealing our silver."

The BVD is to have its staff cut from 640 to 580 by January 1 to improve efficiency.

Deputy Denies Olof Palme's Involvement With KGB

LD0511213190 Moscow TASS in English 2008 GMT
5 Nov 90

[by LETA-TASS correspondent David Gefter]

[Text] Riga November 5—Soviet member of parliament Nikolay Neiland refuted the allegation about Olof Palme's "involvement" with the KGB. "The Swedish prime minister who died a tragic death had never been a KGB agent," Neiland told this correspondent. He made this statement in connection with the fact that Colonel of the KGB Oleg Gordiyevsky, who fled the Soviet Union in 1985, wrote in the book he published in Britain that Nikolay Neiland who worked as head of the NOVOSTI Press Agency bureau in Stockholm had been instructed to recruit Olof Palme.

"I had truly good, cordial relations with Palme, although he was a prime minister and I was only a journalist," Neiland said. "I came from Latvia, from the city where his grandfather and mother once lived. We played tennis with Palme, met at football and ice-hockey matches and talked for hours."

"By the way, I have never been a KGB agent," Neiland said. "No one has even suggested this to me. Nevertheless, it was no secret to me that both my deputies represented the KGB. But I have never wrote any reports to the KGB," he said.

"True, the Soviet ambassador to Sweden, knowing of my good relations with Palme, sometimes asked about his opinion of the Soviet Union's foreign policy," Neiland said.

"Gordiyevsky's assertions cast a slur on Palme. I think his book will cause negative repercussions in the Swedish press," Neiland said.

Nikolay Neiland is secretary of the Foreign Relations Committee of Soviet parliament, former Latvian deputy foreign minister.

Shevardnadze, Dumas Discuss France-USSR Ties

PM0511163090 Moscow NEW TIMES
in English No 44, 30 Oct-5 Nov 90 pp 16-17

[Report on interviews with French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by Galina Sidorova in Vienna; date not given: "A New Entente"]

[Text] Vienna-Moscow—"Dining out in Vienna?" my colleagues joked when they heard I was going to Vienna to cover the meetings of the Soviet and French Foreign Ministers. The whole trip was to last just eight hours. Why did Shevardnadze and Dumas decide to meet in Vienna? The famous Vienna schnitzels were obviously not the only reason. Diplomats are now concluding the work on the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe and other documents to be signed at the Paris Conference of heads of 34 CSCE countries. This allowed the

ministers to save time and listen to first-hand reports from their representatives at the Vienna talks.

Ministers Shevardnadze and Dumas faced the difficult task of removing the final differences from the new Soviet-French treaty which the two Presidents will sign soon in Paris. The ministers did a good job. The Treaty on Concord and Cooperation between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the French Republic will become another milestone accord of the post-Cold War epoch.

The treaty contains no figures, which would have taken years to agree to in the past. It reflects a new philosophy in Franco-Soviet relations. From now on the USSR and France will regard each other as friendly states and will base their relations on trust, solidarity and cooperation. Moscow and Paris advocate a common European home and a common European confederation. In other words, the treaty reflects both the Soviet and the French ideas on the future structure of Europe. Human dignity, human rights and democracy must be supreme values in the European Community, the signatories agree. Relations between states must be based on respect for territorial integrity and political independence, inviolability of borders, rejection of the use of force or the threat to use force, except for the cases mentioned in the United Nations Charter.

The signatories believe that defensive military strategies and practical implementation of the concept of reasonable defence by all states will be a decisive contribution to the cause of European and international security. Both countries are determined to promote universal and complete disarmament under rigid international control, consulting each other in cases of crisis affecting their security.

The Soviet Union and France will develop bilateral cooperation and collaborate in international economic organizations. The priority significance is attached to cooperation in the spheres which are of special importance to the future of both countries: environment protection, agriculture, power generation, safety of atomic power stations, transportation, telecommunications, television, space exploration and industrial conversion. Direct links between plants and factories will be encouraged. The French side will assist the Soviet Union in switching over to free market relations in the economy and in personnel training. There are plans to simplify on a reciprocal basis visa procedures.

I ask the French minister: What does France expect from the new treaty, and what does France hope to gain from it economically and politically?

R. Dumas. "I believe this is a treaty projected into the future. It must become an instrument that helps develop comprehensive bilateral cooperation. It takes into account the changes going on in each country."

The Soviet-French entente, however, does not mean a complete concord on all points, as the final drafting of

the treaty demonstrated. The French remain very sensitive about their nuclear weapons. They regard their nuclear potential as an integral element of France as a great power. Besides, they believe France's national nuclear arsenals are so small in comparison with the Soviet and American ones that they cannot become the subject of any account. Taking this viewpoint into account, Moscow did not insist on preserving the nuclear aspect of disarmament in the new treaty. After all, politics is a competition. Today, probably for the first time in history, both countries are competing openly and honestly. We know the concerns of our partners, and they know ours. As a result, we are becoming allies and each partner gains in terms of European security and stability. Moscow respects the nuances of French politics in the European Community. The French side displays understanding of the Soviet Union's economic and ethnic woes. Both sides realize that the practical effect of the new Soviet-French treaty will depend on how the domestic situation in the USSR develops. As for the French side, its preparedness to sign the treaty with the Soviet Union was, in a sense, intensified by German unification and the big Soviet-German treaty on partnership and good-neighbourliness and cooperation. The fears of Germany's growing political and economic might in the context of its cooperation with the Soviet Union must have been at work. After all, everything is interconnected in politics. Changes in the Soviet Union put an end to the Cold War and touched off new processes in Europe, making German unity a reality. In turn, German unity facilitated the construction of a united Europe and of its legal foundation.

In this situation the utterings of some Supreme Soviet deputies accusing the Soviet Foreign Ministry of unsatisfactory international legal guarantees of Soviet national interests sounds quite out of place. Soviet diplomacy has been highly efficient: a major treaty with France was ready in a few months' time, so was the Soviet-German treaty, so are the multilateral accords to be signed at the CSCE conference in Paris.

A question to Minister Shevardnadze.

Could the treaty with France be seen in isolation from the treaty with Germany?

E. Shevardnadze. "The common European home or, as the French politicians prefer to call it, the European confederation has a common roof. We all live in a common political climate. This sociopolitical atmosphere is consolidated by bilateral relations, commitments, new Soviet-French and Soviet-German relations. I believe we will be able to sign a joint declaration with Spain during President Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Madrid.

We may sign a large-scale economic agreement with Spain. My Spanish colleague assured me in New York that his country had certain capabilities to render material assistance for perestroika. We are preparing a treaty on friendship and cooperation with Italy. Consultations

are being conducted with Great Britain and other states. Naturally, we will have to consider the legal base of our relations with the East European countries. On the one hand, there is the common European process, the creation of a common economic, legal and cultural space. On the other hand, there are the bilateral relations of equal states."

Even the very venue of this Soviet-French ministerial meeting highlighted the significance of the common European context for new Soviet-French relations, especially if one takes into account the fact that on the eve of the meeting experts from 22 states finalized the joint NATO/Warsaw Pact declaration to be signed in November in Paris. I will not disclose any important secrets if I specify some details of this declaration today. Paragraph one: in the new epoch which is approaching in the European relations the states signatories of this Declaration are no longer enemies and extend a hand of friendship to each other. They recognize the inseparable connection between the security of each state and the security of all states. They pledge to preserve such a military potential that is necessary to prevent war and to provide for an effective defence. They shall bring their military doctrines in conformity with this principle. The signatories affirm that each state has the right to be or not to be a member of an allied treaty. They call for immediate enactment of the CSCE Treaty on Conventional Forces and favour the prospect of Soviet-American talks on the reduction of battlefield nuclear weapons.

The declaration is mostly based on the NATO draft, but some Soviet proposals were also included. The document was finalized in a month.

A question to Foreign Minister Shevardnadze:

The Paris CSCE meeting of 34 was planned well in advance. And the question of Mikhail Gorbachev's visits to France and Spain on the eve of the Paris Conference was settled only recently. Is it an attempt to synchronize our bilateral relations with Western partners with the rate of the common European process?

E. Shevardnadze, "Quite so. The signing of important accords with France and Germany and of a Soviet-Spanish declaration will facilitate the success of the Paris Conference. This was what we mostly proceeded from in our plans."

The accords mentioned by Minister Shevardnadze attest to a new level of diplomacy, to a diplomatic efficiency unthinkable in the past, to the artful selection of priorities and the ability to balance one's own interest with the interests of one's partner. Naturally, as in any other sphere of human activity, foreign politics cannot completely avoid occasional errors.

The establishment of new relations with Western Europe is a painful parting with real and imaginary fears. Even the status of a future accord can be a problem: will it be a treaty or a declaration? London prefers to sign a

declaration, for instance, the evolution of relations between the Soviet Union and East European countries may pose even more formidable difficulties. In my opinion, our reasonable policies and common economic problems will eventually make us genuine allies. Eastern Europe is too tired of the Soviet Big Brother and too dissatisfied with the results of cooperation with Moscow.

However, one cannot speak about the loss of allies without mentioning the new allies this country has acquired. The treaties with Germany and France make these countries real political allies of the Soviet Union. In this context, how justified are lamentations heard frequently at the USSR Supreme Soviet that the Soviet Union has lost all its allies.

There is one more thing that impressed me rather unpleasantly at the foreign policy hearings at the Supreme Soviet shortly before the Vienna ministerial.

When the Minister of Defence of the USSR and other top brass, after lengthy bargaining follow the diplomats and sign directives to Soviet teams at various disarmament talks, receive foreign counterparts and tour "potentially hostile" states, the stubbornness of some soldiers-turned MPs in attacking Soviet foreign policymakers seems rather strange. Is it a manifestation of pluralism infiltrating the defence department? Or plain political intrigues?

When asked by one journalist about the main difficulties in his work, Minister Shevardnadze said "political instability in the country" was the greatest hindrance.

There is one more hindrance as well: political intriguing. Is there any other word to describe Deputy Petrusenko's statement at the Supreme Soviet: "Anyone, myself included, could secure the Soviet Union's interests through concessions and often unjustified ones."

As in many other spheres, foreign policy is threatened by incompetence and a lack of professionalism. One day incompetence and the lack of professionalism may rob us of our allies: I mean voluntary allies, not allies compelled by force as before.

NATO's Woerner Calls for Cooperation With USSR
LD0611143190 Moscow TASS in English 1416 GMT
6 Nov 90

[Text] Lisbon November 6 TASS—NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner, on an official visit here, told a news conference that NATO is interested in the success of the Soviet Union's economic, political and social reforms and is determined to promote them. He said that security in Europe and the whole world largely depends on this.

Woerner noted that the North Atlantic alliance is now striving to build relations with the Soviet Union on the basis of cooperation, not confrontation.

NATO's new strategic concept proceeds from the view that because of changes taking place in Europe—German unification, successful negotiations on arms reduction, development of cooperation among European countries—there is no real threat of war and aggression to NATO countries.

Nevertheless, the risk remains since large numbers of nuclear weapons are kept by superpowers and NATO is striving to balance their ceilings on a mutually acceptable basis, Woerner said. He said that NATO which, in his opinion, is continued to be regarded as an instrument of ensuring stability in Europe should maintain a reasonable level of defence potential.

He said that NATO strongly favours the elimination of chemical weapons and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and will exert every effort to prevent the transfer of missile technology to third countries.

Regarding the Gulf crisis the NATO secretary general said that the North Atlantic Alliance is for the unswerving implementation of the UN Security Council resolutions and for the observance of the embargo against Iraq. He did not preclude other possibilities of removing the crisis, also by a military way.

UN Security Council Seat for Germany Considered

*LD0511213690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1600 GMT 5 Nov 90*

[Text] Another telegram from Bonn reports that the influential Atlantic Council in the United States has expressed itself in favor of offering Germany a seat as a permanent member of the UN Security Council. A DPA correspondent reminds us that this idea was initially put forward, as it says in the telegram, by Nikolay Portugalov, an adviser to the Kremlin. Nikolay Sergeyevich works in the international section of the CPSU Central Committee, and in one of his talks with German journalists he expressed an idea of this nature, but I believe that he himself is not very pleased at finding himself being quoted in such a context and even less so with such fanfare.

As concerns the essence of this problem, well, it is certainly worth thinking about, since a permanent member of the Security Council has not so many rights as obligations, and such membership imposes a high level of responsibility.

TASS Previews Gorbachev Visit to FRG

*LD0611145790 Moscow TASS in English 1432 GMT
6 Nov 90*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Moscow November 6 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev's first visit to a united Germany in a few days' time signifies the beginning of the new era in Soviet-German relations.

The Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany, having cast off the grim legacy of the cold war, received a good opportunity to use political and economic potentials for the construction of a new united Europe, of a durable and fair world order, including stable structures of security. This cardinal idea is recorded in the Treaty of Goodneighbourliness, Partnership and Cooperation that Mikhail Gorbachev and Helmut Kohl are to sign in Bonn.

There exist favourable conditions for rapprochement between the USSR and the FRG, and for upgrading the quality and level of their cooperation. The German people have solved their national task in a peaceful, democratic way, in accord with the USSR, with three Western powers, with neighbours of the FRG and the GDR.

The Soviet Union has taken the biggest step since 1917 towards the democratisation of the socio-political system and transfer to a market economy. There is no doubt that the USSR will overcome its present difficulties and because of its huge consumer market and reserves of energy sources and raw materials will remain for united Germany one of the most desirable trading partners in the East.

For this purpose both sides should create new structures of economic cooperation on the basis of market relations, should manifest more initiative and enterprise, conducting a broad exchange of people and ideas and removing the linguistic and ideological barriers.

The strengthening of partnership between these two European countries is fully in keeping with the tendency towards overcoming the split in Europe and building the foundation of a common European home.

Genscher Urges West's Support for Soviet Reforms

*LD06111110390 Moscow TASS in English 1048 GMT
6 Nov 90*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov]

[Text] Bonn November 6 TASS—FRG Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher urged the West to give a vigorous support to the policy of reforms conducted in the Soviet Union and other East European countries.

"I watch with concern how some in the West who initially welcomed Gorbachev's policy now wait to see where the 'developments in the Soviet Union and other East European countries will lead,' Genscher said in an interview with Rias radio station circulated here today. "We would like to warn against this attitude. We should vigorously support and assist what happens there," he said.

"It is the West's responsibility that the perestroika policy it supports economically and technologically be crowned with success," Genscher said.

"What we mean are not some gifts to the East, but capital investments in our joint European future. Stability in Europe will be determined not so much by military factors as by economic, social and ecological factors. We should put our common European home in order. To achieve this the West should be ready to give assistance. It should not assume a wait-and-see stance, should not be an indifferent observer," Genscher said.

Regarding Gorbachev's concept of the common European home Genscher said: "This is an apt expression for it reflects European unity in multiformity. Many peoples inhabit this home, and each arranges its dwelling as it sees fit. The notion of 'the common European home' also includes the idea of peace. The German word 'Hausfrieden' reflects the striving for accord and goodneighbourliness. But there cannot be peace in the house if some go hungry, while others live in abundance. Therefore, it is necessary to create balanced economic, social and ecological conditions in this home," the minister said.

Genscher said that the European process started in Helsinki should create stable framework taking place in East and central Europe and for the integration of entire Europe. "This is something new in European history. Therefore, we attach great importance to the upcoming Paris summit of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe."

Regarding the future role of a united Germany, Genscher said that the country situated in the centre of Europe bears special responsibility. What happens in Germany concerns entire Europe. "We are aware of our responsibility for peace in Europe and the world. Therefore it is important that we have given up power politics forever and speak of responsibility," Genscher said.

Article Urges Strengthening Ties With Germany

91UF0063A Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian No 34, 24 Aug 90 p 19

[Article by Aleksandr Fomenko, editor of the LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA political science department: "A Moscow-Berlin Axis?"]

[Text] The seemingly old Russian-German theme keeps becoming topical over and over again. Over and over again one is reminded of the half-century-old treatise of one of Russia's greatest political thinkers, F.I. Tyutchev: "Russia and Germany." One is not simply reminded of it, by the way, but one must also reread it avidly and attentively. Just as today we reread Tyutchev's article "Russia and the Revolution" (for our relations with Germany are fatefully linked to our relations with the revolution—about which more later).

When, in the middle of the eighties, Chancellor H. Kohl started talking about a "new peace settlement for Germany" "under a European roof," about the "dividing line between East and West" that was unacceptable to

Germany, A.N. Yakovlev (now a member of the Presidential Council) was unable to conceal his irritation: "Is this really anything more than an appeal to redraw the map of Europe in the American-West German manner?"

¹ Now certain observers are already beginning to discuss the appearance of a Moscow-Bonn axis (or Moscow-Berlin?).

There is some basis for these discussions—Moscow's political concessions and Bonn's economic ones at the summit meeting in Arkhyz (Northern Caucasus) for many people were more than unexpected and were decisive. For the first time since World War II, with the mutual image of the enemy that has become ingrained in Russians and Germans over many years, Russia and Germany, judging from the statements of Federal Chancellor H. Kohl and President M.S. Gorbachev, are extending their hands to one another in friendship. It is Russia and Germany and not the USSR and the FRG—that is, the peoples, the subjects of history, and not any artificial state formations that have arisen as a result of historical misunderstandings.

While the FRG and the GDR are uniting into Germany, the USSR—to the sound of shouts about the need for a "new Union treaty"—is gradually being broken apart by separatists of all possible stripes. With the now obvious collapse of Soviet-communist ideology, it is becoming more and more difficult to maintain the military-political association of the "republics" that were created at one time to replace the unified Russian state in order to destroy its memory once and for all. Their imagined statehood presented no danger to the rulers of the USSR then, when they were prepared at any time to apply force for the sake of keeping the entire "Union" territory under the ideological, political, and economic supervision of the center. But today any chief of an armed group of fighting men may refuse to carry out the most threatening order from the USSR president....

If Russia and Germany find a common language they will be able to restore historical justice with respect to the Baltic question. We have the experience not only of the Russo-German struggle for this region, but also of the joint Russo-German (and with the participation of other healthy forces) assimilation of it. Although the eastern and Baltic Slavs appeared here before the Germans did (the first German settlers appeared at the mouth of the Dvina-Daugava in 1184 with the permission of Polota area Prince Vladimir), the Russians had many points at which to apply their state energy; they were too involved in the East and the South, and thus the prolonged struggle of Kievan and Muscovite Rus against German encroachment, which lasted for centuries with varying degrees of success, ended only during the reign of Petr I—with the inclusion of the German (!) Ostsee provinces in the Russian empire (while the region's German character was preserved).

When Germany tried by financing subversive organizations in Russia (both revolutionaries and those same Ukrainian separatists) to crowd out its great eastern

neighbor during World War I (while the German Ostsee population remained faithful to the Russian crown), it accomplished nothing. The Russian empire collapsed, but the German empire came tumbling down right after it, and the Baltic republics turned away not only from Russia but also from Germany. When the attempt to move east was repeated during World War I, Germany lost completely, including the port of Memel (Klaipeda) and its environs, East Prussia proper, and Pomerania (Pomorje). On the other hand, the USSR had to take revenge against the Germans after its victory in the last war: Stalin gave Memel to the Lithuanians, East Prussia was settled by Slavs, Pomerania was turned over to the Poles, and Russian Germans from Central Russia were sent to Siberia and Kazakhstan—and, right before our eyes, the Baltic separatists, lacking the discipline derived from the neighboring German element, began to undermine the geopolitical stability of the Russian Baltic area.

Regardless of how much the USSR central government has resisted increasing the number of Slavs in the middle of Russia, with the strengthening of the already uncontrolled separatism and nationalism on the outskirts, more and more of them will be leaving the "republics." And the authorities will have to deal with accommodating them, which means restoration of the destroyed middle of Russia.

The Russians who have met in the places where they have lived since time immemorial (not only within the borders of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic as conceived by Stalin, but also in the Baltic area, in the Kazakh lands around Semipalatinsk, and in other places) will for the first time in many years be given the opportunity to work for themselves—for Great, Little, and White Russia, Siberia, and the Far East—and not for the "communist future" for "our country and the entire world."

While the Armenians (who have already risen up against the Russian soldiers and thus betrayed their eternal saviors) are fighting with the Azeris; the Georgians, gripped by nationalist arrogance, are losing what is left of their already weak forces in an attempt to stand up against Muslim pressure; and while the Central Asian peoples are clarifying their relations with one another and with their greedy southern neighbors—we, the Russians (not only Great Russians, but the Little Russians, and Belorussians) will have to "stand guard over" our southeastern borders and build and restore our own power. Of course we cannot—much as we may want to—escape our geopolitical destiny (to maintain relative stability in Eurasia). But we will get a respite—it is difficult to tell how long it will last. And we should take advantage of it, including strengthening our relations with Germany and, consequently, strengthening European stability.

The return of the German population to the Baltic area, to East Prussia (now, and not when this will have to be

done)—which is becoming, in my view, a historical inevitability—would be useful, namely to the Russians today.

There are not likely to be many Ostsee emigrants living in the west of Germany who would like to return to the homeland of their ancestors forever, but the Russian Germans could quite well be the linking element for Russian Balts. (Emigrants from the USSR will not be able to count on beneficial conditions in the unified Germany).

The relative internal similarity of their national customs and ways of life and thinking, in spite of all the glaring differences—in combination with the deep, already age-old traditions of coexistence and interaction—makes it possible for the Russians and Germans, taught by the bitter experience of war, to hope for the establishment of special relations between the unified Germany and Russia—the latter being relieved of its rebellious outlying regions and its Marxist "allies" on all continents—even in the near future. And the rest of Europe should not fear the German-Russian rapprochement—it, this rapprochement, is natural and understandable. Just as special relations between this same Germany and France are understandable: The experience of conflict can be surmounted only by persistent and purposeful cooperation.

For more than a century Russia has withstood the revolutionary instability in Europe. Having collapsed (not without help from Europe) under the blows of the revolution, the historical Russia became the USSR—"the stronghold of the world revolutionary movement." Only today are we, the Russians, returning to our normal role (for we are deeply conservative by nature) and at the same time we are parting with the image of the German enemy, which originated in the bloody suffering of World War II. This war, which exhausted us to the limit, was accompanied by propagandistic lies on both sides. The German soldiers were told that they were fighting against communism and liberating Russia from it; and many officers and generals understood this as their mission (although, of course, Rosenberg and Hitler, possessed by the racist idea, were striving not for liberation but for de-Russification of Russia). Conversely, Soviet soldiers, were told more about the danger of Russia's enslavement by Germans without focusing attention on the protection of "Marxist" communism as such. Close scrutiny should be given to the fact that up until the end, Hitler, too, was against the creation of national Russian armed forces under Russian command, and it seems that Stalin was most afraid of the leakage of information about Russian units fighting along with Germans against communism.² And yet only five years before the beginning of the Vlasov movement (a new phase of civil war and counterrevolution) the communist leaders themselves were speaking ecstatically about escalating the class struggle in the counter, that is, about the continuation of the civil war.

Now both Germany and Russia, having paid all their bills in full—from both national socialism and international communism—must draw the correct conclusions from their defeats. Both the desire for expansion of their physical living space and the desire for the expansion of the communist sphere of influence have led us equally quickly to failure, to the appearance—for the first time in history—of the Russian emigration and to another division of the Germans. In 40 years, fortunately, West Germany has not wasted its energy on political and ideological insanity—as distinct from East Germany and from us. We are just now coming to our senses and rejecting the ruinous and adventuristic geopolitics—and in so doing, incidentally, we are helping the Germans as well: Russia's national interests do not contradict Germany's national interests.

There is a remarkable similarity in our geopolitical situations: Germany is a kind of intermediary and arbitrator between West and East Europe, between the Romano-German world and the Slavo-Russian one. Russia, the Eurasian giant, is the same kind of intermediary and arbitrator between Europe and Asia, between the Western, Christian world and the Eastern world—Muslim, pagan, and Buddhist.

The Germans not only live in lands that were once populated by Slavs (their descendants are the Lusatian Serbs who live near Leipzig), but they have long lived among Russians in Russia. Therefore, there is nothing degrading for us in receiving help from Germany: At one time, in that same 18th century, Germans from the ruined Germany traveled to the bountiful Russia, which gave them food and shelter, and now the bountiful Germany is helping the destroyed Russia to get on her feet. And in so doing it is strengthening Europe (!).

Europe suffered for a long time from its own instability and inter-European conflicts. Today, at a time of constant conflicts on other continents, it is especially important to preserve the European balance and the balance in Eurasian Russia. Or to speak more broadly and straightforwardly, the balance of the Eurasian-American developed North in the face of the unstable, fermenting developing South.

It is no accident that the opposition between Eastern and Western civilization is dying down just as the opposition between North and South is making itself known more and more loudly. And the South in the form of its most extremist forces is already disturbing world order. At a time when in the North—in Europe and America above all—right-wing conservatism is becoming stronger (the only thing capable of rationally conducting deep structural transformations in the economy), in the South—Africa and Asia—all kinds of revolutionary radicalism are increasingly holding sway.

The unanimous disturbance of the North (not in the purely geographical sense, of course) with the seizure of Kuwait by Saddam Husayn's troops—which could disturb the world economic-political order—shows the

beginning of the end of the East-West confrontation. "Small empires" of the "Third World" are not likely to moderate their appetites of their own accord: The European giant, Germany, and the Eurasian giant, Russia, will have not only to compete with the North American giant but will also have to help it maintain the stable status quo in the world.

Footnotes

1. From the collection, "Against Militarism and Revanchism", Prague, 1986.
2. The Russian Army, incidentally, never had as many deserters as the Soviet Army did—why?

Moiseyev Sees Off Visiting Finnish Admiral

PM0211160390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 1 Nov 90 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Tour of Country"]

[Text] Admiral J. Klenberg, commander in chief of the Finnish Defense Forces, who has been on an official visit to the USSR, left on a tour of the country 31 October.

The guest and the officials accompanying him were seen off at the airport by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, and by other Soviet Armed Forces generals, admirals, and officers.

Officials Visit Finland To Discuss Human Rights

PM3010144790 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET
in Swedish 24 Oct 90 p 24

[Report on undated interview with Vladimir Fateyev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals Committee, by Staffan Bruun: "Today There Is No Respect at All for Our Laws"]

[Text] Yesterday the Finnish Human Rights Association began a two-day seminar for guests from the Soviet Union. Eleven high-ranking Soviet politicians and officials are in Finland to learn about protection under the law, human rights, and democratic controls over the authorities.

K.-J. Lang, who is chairman of the Finnish Human Rights Association, said that the cooperation between lawyers in Finland and the Soviet Union began in January when a Finnish delegation visited the Supreme Soviet.

"During that visit we were given an account of the current situation in the Soviet Union. Now we are introducing our Soviet guests to the situation in Finland."

The Soviet delegation includes some official representatives of the Supreme Soviet, its glasnost committee, and

the Russian legislature and some representatives of unofficial organizations such as the Soviet CSCE monitoring group, and various Baltic organizations. The delegation numbers 11 members.

"The Soviet guests have principally been interested in how we uphold legality in administration and combating corruption. This is a major problem in the Soviet Union," K.-J. Lang said.

The seminar program includes a long series of study visits. The Soviet guests have visited HELSINGIN SANOMAT and discussed press freedom; they have visited the legislative commissioner for the judiciary and civil administration and discussed how the complaints of ordinary citizens are dealt with; they have visited some prisons, and the town of Jarvenpaa to get acquainted with local government in a small town.

Vladimir Fateyev is the chairman of the Supreme Soviet's glasnost committee. Ordinary citizens send their complaints about the abuse of power and arbitrary treatment by the authorities to the committee.

"We have three main functions: ensuring the noninfringement of human rights, following up the complaints of individual citizens, and overseeing press freedom," Vladimir Fateyev told HUFVUDSTADSBLADET.

According to Fateyev, the committee, which has only 13 members, has no chance of actively following up every single complaint.

"We go through the complaints and follow them up in the legislative work of the Supreme Soviet. Our main task is to create a mechanism which guarantees that the laws that are made increase the rights of citizens.

"We take the initiative for improvements to laws, we contact officials and follow up private initiatives—on environmental issues, for example. Individual complaints are only followed up if they reflect a phenomenon of general importance."

According to Vladimir Fateyev, one such complaint concerned the pollution of the beaches in Odessa.

"We received many complaints about the ecological problems in Odessa. We contacted various authorities and ministries about the matter. We pointed out that something had to be done. We went to the place itself and were able to see the breadth of the problem and we recommended a model for a solution."

The glasnost committee has no powers to make decisions.

"But ministers ought to enjoy the confidence of the Supreme Soviet. So anyone who wants to stay on in his post cannot entirely ignore our recommendations. In the Odessa case the minister responsible took steps after we had intervened."

A problem which Vladimir Fateyev recently dealt with was a conflict between the weekly, OGONEK, and the top military leadership. In reports OGONEK had written about the Army in very negative terms.

"The admirals and generals were very bitter and demanded that OGONEK be silenced. It became our task to bring together the generals and OGONEK's journalists for a joint meeting. To begin with the atmosphere was rancorous, but once we had explained the contents of the new law on press freedom to the military leadership they calmed down.

"At the same time we reminded the journalists of their responsibility to report the facts accurately.

"The committee cannot decide on a punishment for journalists or anything else. But both sides accepted our mediation on that occasion."

According to Vladimir Fateyev, the glasnost committee is the only body to which people who are dissatisfied can turn. A division of its work along Finnish lines into parliamentary commissioner for the judiciary and civil administration, attorney general, consumer ombudsman, equality ombudsman, press council, and so on could become possible at a later date.

"At present we must concentrate on what is most important. New problems are arising all the time because of new legislation. Recently laws on press freedom, freedom of religion, and freedom of association have been approved. The last of these laws means in practice that we have introduced a multiparty system.

"The problem is to get information about the new laws out to the citizens. We could do with a law about the dissemination of information. Out of old habit the new laws are seen as state secrets and this means that people do not know about them.

"Another law which we ought to create soon should cover the right of access to archives. Today researchers do not have the access to the archives that they should have for them to be able to write the history of our country.

"A law on television should be passed as soon as possible. In the United States the law on television is several thousand pages thick. In the Soviet Union the present law on television is only a short sentence in the law on the mass media. Also the first private television stations will soon begin broadcasting."

The question of how aircraft hijacker Mikhail Varfolomeyev could be classed as mentally ill in the Soviet Union while in Finland he was considered to be healthy was at first the subject of a joke from Fateyev.

"Congratulations, you cured him quickly!"

"But, joking aside, we freely admit that human rights have been trampled underfoot in the Soviet Union.

Absolute nihilism has dominated the authorities' attitude toward the right of citizens to enjoy protection under the law.

"This has led to a situation in which ordinary people have lost all respect for the law. In the past the most important question for people was not what the laws said but how they could contact those people who made the decisions in order to plead their case. Our freedom of telephone communications was about how you could get in touch with the authorities."

One of the biggest reforms being prepared by the Supreme Soviet concerns the right to leave the Soviet Union.

"The question is a difficult one, but we are prepared to give citizens the right to travel freely. And now it is foreign countries that are warning us against approving a law which would result in large-scale emigration."

Vladimir Fateyev said that the most important lesson the Soviet Union can learn from Finland is respect for the law.

"We have to get the rule-of-law state to work. This means that the state is a large number of legal agreements between authorities, enterprises, and citizens. These agreements must be respected."

"But today the Soviet Union is without many of the agreements which govern the activity of society. We have no law on trade unions. We have no uniform pension system, but we are looking at present at a pension reform."

"Something else that has impressed me here in Finland is the attention to detail with which lawyers and experts go through the laws. The laws that perestroika needs are all urgent. Nevertheless we must not make mistakes. We need the same attention to detail."

According to Fateyev, the seminar in Helsinki is being held in an open and critical spirit.

"In the past when we met Finnish colleagues we used to say how good everything was. Now our Finnish colleagues are very critical of many phenomena in the Soviet Union. This is good; our eyes are being opened to many evils. But in the past the Finns said nothing about them...."

Vladimir Fateyev admitted that the fault lay on the Soviet side.

"We did not listen. We thought that the Soviet Union is such a large country that everything we do is right. Today we know better. We know that we are far behind many other countries when it comes to human rights."

Latin America & Caribbean

Politburo's Shenin Interviewed on Cuban Visit

PM0511114590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4

[Interview with O.S. Shenin, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, by correspondent A. Moiseyev; in Havana on 1 November: "The Trip Was Fruitful"]

[Text] Havana, 1 Nov—The visit to Cuba by a CPSU Central Committee delegation, headed by O.S. Shenin, Politburo member and secretary of our party's Central Committee, has ended. It was here at the invitation of the leadership of the republic's Communist Party. The three days spent on Cuban soil were filled with meetings, conversations, and a frank exchange of opinions.

"I am satisfied with the trip," O. Shenin said. "It was fruitful. There were many interesting meetings and conversations at the Cuban Communist Party [PCC] Central Committee, at enterprises, scientific centers, and educational establishments, in the capital and in the provinces. I could see that the Cubans are advocates of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet people and I heard many warm words about our country. During conversations with people I became aware of their concern about the complex problems the USSR is experiencing today. I could see that people in Cuba understand our difficulties and are doing everything necessary to ensure that they affect their lives as little as possible. I must say that the republic's leadership is counting on our being able to preserve our friendship and cooperation."

[Moiseyev] As is known, one sometimes meets in certain Soviet publications very strong criticism of cooperation between our countries, of Cuban reality. How do you regard such pieces?

[Shenin] In itself, criticism, if well-meaning, has a creative function. One can criticize mistakes and errors in our economic links on the basis of serious analysis. But I believe it is our side that deserves the most criticism. But when basic ethics are violated it looks dishonest and unseemly. Wholesale vilification is an insult to the Cuban people. I believe that the USSR Government should make an official statement about it.

I believe that destructive pieces introduce a very unpleasant element into our relations with Cuba and undermine them. Those who are attempting to nullify with a stroke of the pen decades of our friendship and cooperation forget the old saw: A friend in need is a friend indeed. My impression is that the going is extremely tough for Cuba at the moment and we should not be aggravating the situation, but, rather, quietly analyzing the multitude of complex issues, seeking solutions, and restructuring outmoded cooperation mechanisms in our peoples' interests.

[Moiseyev] Oleg Semenovitch, I would like to ask another delicate question. Plenty has been said and written about Soviet-Cuban economic relations. This is natural: They are extensive and require profound improvements. But Cuba has a powerful neighbor, which, judging by foreign press reports, would welcome our breaking with the Island of Freedom; indeed, there has been no letup in Washington's economic blockade. But nothing lasts forever. See what the future holds: The blockade ended and neighbors busy cooperating. Do you not think that the Cuban friends would no longer need such extensive links with a distant partner overseas?

[Shenin] We favor normalization of relations between Cuba and the United States. I believe that a basis for this already exists. For example, a step has been taken to facilitate contacts between relatives. Cubans living in the United States can visit relatives on the island. Of course, there are serious and very fundamental obstacles between the neighbors. I believe the Soviet Union will endeavor to stimulate their removal. I am absolutely convinced that this would not be detrimental to Soviet-Cuban relations.

[Moiseyev] It seems to me that ties between the CPSU and the PCC are still strong. But the situation is now changing in both countries. It is also changing, I believe, in relations between the parties.

[Shenin] I would describe our interparty ties as normal and I think they will remain so in the future. This is my belief. I also think that we will now be looking more closely at one another, not from the old positions—"do as I do"—but with a new formula in mind: "What are we doing and what are you doing?" The conversations with Fidel Castro, and they were very long and detailed, and the meetings with other Cuban party leaders show that they are beginning to change many things in the party—in the structure, in the matter of assisting the elective organs of authority, and in work on organizing party Central Committee commissions. A great deal is being done to improve party committees' work in residential areas. I believe this experience should be scrutinized. We must very significantly strengthen cooperation between the parties and maintain constant contacts.

Visits Shows 'Strong Ties'

PM0511141590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Nov 90 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Strong Ties"]

[Text] The working visit which O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, paid to Cuba was brief. His stay in the country at the invitation of the Communist Party of Cuba leadership lasted from 29 through 31 October. But in terms of the intensity of the meetings, conversations, and discussions at a crucial moment in the development of the Soviet Union and Cuba and of our relations the visit was far removed from traditional contacts of this kind. There was not only an exchange of views on recent events in the

life of the CPSU and the PCC but also a serious discussion of the fate of the two countries and peoples.

The Cubans have their own characteristics of socialist building. But they are following with great attention the perestroika processes taking place in our country. Despite fabrications that have appeared in the press about Cuba's negative attitude to Soviet perestroika, it was demonstrable that both the leaders of the Cuban revolution and the broad masses of the population have a profound interest in the success of the transformations in our country.

The PCC itself has been the initiator of major changes showing that Cuba is not standing aside from the dynamic processes of socialism's renewal. Questions concerned with democratizing the party, abandoning the supplanting of state organs, and switching to primarily political methods of work by party committees and organizations are being tackled. In the Cubans' view, the people's authorities should exercise their functions of power while the party should implement political functions.

As Cuban Communists say, there have been numerous mistakes in the course of socialist building, but one mistake there has never been is the loss of the party's link with the people. And we were able to convince ourselves of this—and likewise of the Cuban leader's great authority—at the score or more enterprises, scientific institutes, agricultural associations, and educational establishments which Comrade O.S. Shenin visited together with F. Castro.

What today determines the lives of the Communists and entire people of Cuba?

A characteristic feature of the current period in Cuba is that democratization in the party and society is proceeding in complex external and internal conditions.

Cuba has been compelled to take emergency measures. Strict austerity measures and measures designed to ensure a high degree of organization are being implemented in the country. Considerable manpower, intellectual, and material resources have been channeled into fulfilling the food program.

It is natural that the question of the prospects for Soviet-Cuban economic relations arose in the course of conversations with Cubans and also at the meeting with Soviet experts working in Cuba. This is of course a complex problem falling within the purview of the two governments. But in the context of the elaboration of new approaches to these relations based on the principles of efficacy and mutual benefit, one thing is clear: The disruption of the stability of these ties will lead to a deterioration in the situation in each of the countries. You only have to recall that one-third of the sugar consumed in the USSR comes from this distant island. And tomorrow, if together we manage to cope with the difficulties that have arisen, Cubans are prepared to supply the USSR with considerable quantities of the

latest medical equipment, medical products, and medicines which we need so much.

Any information about the visit to Cuba would be incomplete without a mention of the meetings with Soviet children who survived the Chernobyl disaster and are restoring their health in a superb young pioneers' camp near Havana. The visit to a hospital where casualties of another disaster—Afghanistan—are being treated, was equally emotional. Like many other peoples, the Cubans have not stood aside from our tragedies.

O.S. Shenin's visit to Cuba provided an opportunity to convince oneself of the strength and diversity of the traditional ties between the CPSU and the PCC and the need to further develop them.

Cuban Envoy Discusses Ties, Domestic Tasks

PM0611101490 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 3 Nov 90 First Edition p 5

["Frank Conversation" with Jose R. Balaguer, Cuban ambassador to the USSR, by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Captain S. Sidorov: "Jose R. Balaguer: 'We Are Seeking Our Path'"—place and date not given]

[Text] [Sidorov] We were prompted to ask to meet you by letters and telephone calls to the editorial office from our readers. I would first like you to convey to the entire Cuban people on our readers' behalf our gratitude for their aid to the Soviet Union in organizing treatment and vacations for the children affected by the Chernobyl disaster. Afghan veterans Yu. Tusupov, A. Zubov, S. Pomazenko, and others—more than 100 in total who had a term of rehabilitation and treatment in your country—also convey their words of sincere gratitude to Cuban physicians and nurses. N. Shuba, chairman of the Altay Kray Afghan internationalist soldiers' association, asked me to remind you of his invitation to Cuban internationalist soldiers to visit Altay Kray.

[Balaguer] Thank you. We will assist in implementing this idea without fail.

[Sidorov] In the Soviet press of late, alongside articles with an obvious desire to provide a well-considered analysis of processes taking place on Cuba, biased articles have also begun to appear. They cause embarrassment and perplexity to people who know Cuba firsthand, whose lives were linked at various times with the Cubans' fight for survival in conditions of military threat and economic blockade. I would like to obtain firsthand information about Cuba's life today.

[Balaguer] I think that there is one very important element, which must be understood if you are to grasp what is happening in our country. The path that the Cuban revolution took could not be level and straight. Apart from the Soviet Union, no one had traveled it before us. Certainly, we made mistakes, but we also set them right. The First Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Congress gave an extremely critical analysis of the path

we had covered. If you flip through the congress materials, you will see this for yourself. Some of our current difficulties are the result of our own miscalculations, others are due to the prevailing situation which is beyond our control. The economic blockade and the threat of aggression is another matter. Try to do something with a pistol butt at your head.

There have also been blunders, partially due to borrowing from the experience of other states, where people are now saying that their experience is no good. We have now finally concluded that we have to act on the basis of our own experience and rely on our own ideas. The times when Cuba could allow itself, as Fidel said, "to copy bad things well and good things badly" will not return. We are seeking our own path to a society that will focus on man and his needs, and provide not just some of the people but all of the people with a good life.

[Sidorov] Four years ago a process of transformations began on Cuba which you describe as correcting mistakes and negative trends, or rectification for short. Very little is said about it in our country. Could you outline the main aims and principles of this process and what role the country's leadership plays in it.

[Balaguer] Our leaders have never decided things on camera. They have never concealed the difficulties from the people. Economic disorder, lack of resources, sabotage, armed aggression—all these problems were resolved by the people with complete mutual understanding between working people and political leaders. The rectification process is currently under way under the leadership of the party and Fidel. All the people are participating in it.

The process of correcting mistakes began with the fight against corruption and schematic notions of socialism. We then came to the need for a detailed study of our party's structure and functions, particularly given the unacceptable nature of a multiparty political system for us in the foreseeable future. We have already experienced a multiparty system and we know what it is like. A one-party system emerged in our country as a historical necessity in order to counter the economic blockade and aggression. But we also realize that the party should improve itself and strengthen democratic principles in its life. It should not supplant either the state leadership or economic leadership or encourage the tendency for the bureaucratic apparatus to increase.

As for the economy, here too the process of recognizing mistakes and difficult problems did not begin yesterday. Reality compelled us to do this. The world economic crisis and developing countries' specific problems were all bound to affect us too. Another highly important factor—the economic difficulties in your country, Cuba's main trading partner—has now compounded everything else.

Our most important task today is to eliminate adverse phenomena in the economy, increase the efficiency of all social production, and reduce consumption of energy,

raw materials, and semimanufactures. Our task of the day can be worded as follows—to survive despite all the difficulties. Our people are ready for them. To survive and continue to develop. I repeat, we cannot allow ourselves today the luxury of permitting major mistakes. Correcting negative trends is not a tribute to fashion or a superficial process. It will be implemented steadily on the basis of creative application of Marxism-Leninism, which we consider to be an effective vitally important theory with great potential.

[Sidorov] You mentioned the problem of Soviet-Cuban economic collaboration. Allow me to dwell on it in particular. The spectrum of opinions on this issue in the Soviet Union contains the following view: Cooperation was ineffective and this word itself must therefore be placed in quotemarks. Do you agree with that?

[Balaguer] I cannot agree with this opinion. Even if only because the Soviet people helped us survive at a time when an attempt was being made to bring us to our knees. This was supremely humane cooperation and we can take pride in it. Remember, after all: By instituting the economic blockade of Cuba, the Americans deprived us of the chance to obtain even aspirin from them. The blockade persists to this day. Only two weeks ago a sitting of both chambers of the U.S. Congress adopted additional anti-Cuban measures.

At the same time it cannot be said that Soviet-Cuban cooperation is problem-free today. So let us work together to improve this cooperation. The 30-year history of our relations deserves that. We have something to offer the Soviet Union. We are not a nation of free-loaders, the Cuban people are industrious and talented. We could expand cooperation in the scientific sphere and help the Soviet Union in the development of sugar production. Our cooperation has already shown a tendency to increase in effectiveness. This trend must be backed up.

[Sidorov] An AP correspondent's report was recently transmitted from Miami from which it emerges that the Cuban Government has begun dialogue with moderate groups among Cuban emigres. If that is true, is this step part of the transformation process?

[Balaguer] The U.S. journalist was obviously citing a speech by Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, member of the PCC Central Committee Politburo, in which he did indeed speak of the presence of various political currents among emigres based in Miami. In addition to bellicose extremists, there are also moderate circles there who have abandoned the idea of overthrowing the Cuban Government by force and who want to establish contact with it. C. Rodriguez's statement was obviously interpreted wrongly. There is not in fact any dialogue as such.

[Sidorov] A Moscow newspaper published not so long ago an interview with Rafael del Pino, a former Cuban Air Force general, who deserted to the United States three years ago. The interview contains no more and no

less than a charge against the Cuban supreme military-political leadership of complicity in the drug business and even attempts to provoke conflict between the USSR and the United States. Del Pino is a turncoat and I personally view his "testimony" accordingly. Nonetheless I ask you to comment on this article.

[Balaguer] We have grown accustomed to such masterpieces of psychological warfare broadcast on our airwaves from Florida. But we by no means expected such grossly fabricated disinformation to appear in a Soviet newspaper. Now when the United States describes Cuba as the "only obstacle in the way of a radical improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations" it is easy to guess whom these articles are directed against and why.

As for the accusations, their absurdity is fully in line with Del Pino's personality and hardly merits a point-by-point rebuttal. He only repeats what his U.S. masters tell him and is therefore contemptible. What else can you say about a man who is involved with the Yanks in maneuvers to rehearse the landing of an assault force at the Guantanamo Base, indicating which targets should be struck first and how to eliminate his former subordinates more effectively.

It is incredible but true that plans for the physical elimination of Fidel Castro were discussed by the U.S. Senate. Since it has not been possible to eliminate him physically, lies are being put about with a view to discrediting him. Previously in Cubans' eyes, now in Soviet people's eyes.

[Sidorov] N.S. Khrushchev's memoirs published in the United States claim that during the 1962 "missile crisis" F. Castro suggested that the Soviet leadership inflict a "preemptive" nuclear strike on the United States. Cuba expressed readiness to make public secret documents which refute Khrushchev's words. What documents specifically?

[Balaguer] Correspondence stored in Fidel's personal archive. Certain documents are currently being published revealing the details of those events. An interview with Sergio del Valle, for instance, who was chief of the General Staff at that time.

[Sidorov] The world has changed beyond recognition in the 28 years that have elapsed since then. The upshot is that we and the Americans are "burying" not one another but the "cold war" and ostensibly feel more secure. Do you think that the military threat is also lessening for Cuba?

[Balaguer] We would like to feel more secure but we do not, unfortunately, have grounds for that. The Americans still have in their safes plans for an armed attack on Cuba and rehearse them, as I have already said, in the course of regular exercises. Despite the changes in the world which you have mentioned, the United States committed aggression against Panama. This was done brazenly and provocatively. After that can we have guarantees that they will not attack us?

Cubans want peace most of all. We do not want to invest a single peso in defense, we want normal relations with the United States. But we have been forced to strengthen our defenses to the detriment of peaceful construction since the very first day of our revolution.

[Sidorov] Here is my last question. Considering Cuba's role in international affairs and its proximity to Central America, how, in your view, could Cuba help the process of a peaceful settlement of the armed conflict in El Salvador?

[Balaguer] I do not think that Cuba could play any particular role. We are unable to dictate either to the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front [FMLN] or to A. Cristiani's government. This conflict can only be resolved by the Salvadorans themselves. As far as I know, the FMLN, which is a recognized force, intends to seek a political settlement. I personally believe that the FMLN must reach the same kind of agreement with the government as was reached between the opposing sides in Nicaragua. As in the case of that country we have no intention of interfering in El Salvador's internal affairs.

[Sidorov] Thank you for the conversation.

Cuba Says Khrushchev 'Mistaken' on Missile Crisis

*PM0511162990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 30 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5*

[Unattributed report: "Cuba—Was Khrushchev Mistaken?"]

[Text] Cuba is prepared to make public secret documents of the period of the Caribbean crisis, the 28th anniversary of which is being marked today. Jorge Risquet Valdez, member of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, stated in an interview with the PRENSA LATINA agency Sunday that "after agreement with the Soviet side we can publish correspondence concerning relations between Cuba and the USSR during that period."

J. Risquet Valdes touched on recent statements by Cuban leader Fidel Castro in which he refuted the claim that he advised N.S. Khrushchev during the Caribbean crisis to inflict a preemptive nuclear strike on the United States. As is known, this is what is claimed in memoirs of the former Soviet leader published in the West. "Even if Khrushchev interpreted things this way and wrote this, his statement does not correspond to reality," J. Risquet Valdes indicated. Convincing proof refuting Khrushchev's claims are kept in the archives, which, naturally, the Soviet side also has, he remarked.

J. Risquet Valdes, who took part in an international symposium on the Caribbean crisis in Moscow in January of last year, stated that Cuba is prepared to hold a similar forum with the participation of representatives of Cuba, the USSR, and the United States in Havana at the end of next year. "We have nothing to hide, we do not fear the historical truth," he indicated.

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Chamber Views 'Crimean Question'

PM0511150990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report by O. Kuzmina: "Before the 'Vacation.' At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session"]

[Text] Yesterday the Soviet of the Union embarked on work in committees and commissions. Attendance was well down in the hall where the deputies are holding their sittings. But the atmosphere was no less workmanlike. This is understandable: After all, the USSR Supreme Soviet of Nationalities was discussing a very acute question, on which the future of hundreds of thousands of people depends—the so-called "Crimean question."

R. Nishanov, chairman of the chamber, opened the session, stressed the importance of the question under discussion, and gave the floor to V. Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Commission on the Problems of the Crimean Tatar People. He told the deputies about the course of implementation of the priority tasks connected with the return of the Crimean Tatars to Crimean Oblast.

The census figures given to the commission were much too low: The number of Crimean Tatars is now 300,000-350,000 rather than 272,000. It is clear that the resettlement, employment, and housing and social problems associated with this cannot be tackled in an instant and by a single oblast. Some 13,000 families have already been resettled, although only 8,000 were planned. And problems are emerging. Particularly as by no means all the settlers are behaving in a restrained and patient manner. The speaker stressed that accord, calm, mutual respect between "settlers" and the local authorities, and precise observance of the privileges and rights of those returning to their native land are essential to success.

In connection with the resettlement of the Crimean Tatars and the difficulties this is causing, representatives of the Crimean local authorities said that it is necessary to change the oblast's status so that it can participate in the Union treaty as a separate entity. But the deputies were equivocal even on this.

The deputies adopted by a majority a resolution "On the Course of Implementation of Priority Measures..." recommending that it be amplified in view of the remarks that had been made.

At the end of the sitting the deputies returned to their discussion of the draft law "On Regulating Commercial Brokerage Activities," which was adopted yesterday by the Soviet of the Union chamber, but the Soviet of Nationalities did not have a voting quorum. The draft was adopted again.

R. Nishanov thanked the deputies for their vigorous efforts and said goodbye until mid-November. The legislature is going on "vacation."

Deputy Arutyunyan Claims Speech 'Distortion'

PM0511135990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Letter from USSR People's Deputy L.A. Arutyunyan under "Editorial Mailbag" rubric: "Will We Share Nuclear Bombs?"]

[Text] "I am writing to you because of the disappointing distortion of my speech at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the report which, by direct analogy with Solzhenitsyn's ideas, is headlined 'How We Should Organize the Country' (IZVESTIYA No 269 this year). The report ends as follows: 'The desire of certain deputies to share out literally all Union property and divide it up among the nationalities has gone too far. So far that people are literally getting scared about what they have heard. Thus, Deputy L.A. Arutyunyan said that there is no point in members of the country's Supreme Soviet finding it funny to talk of dividing up property, including nuclear and chemical weapons. This country's might should be divided up between the states that want to leave the USSR.'

"It is hard to comment on this statement, all the more so since it was made by a woman. Sharing out nuclear bombs and weapons of mass destruction on a per capita basis? What could be more absurd? Not everyone would imagine such a thing in their worst nightmare.

"But it was not a nightmare. It was stated in the Union legislature."

"This is scathing but it does not square with reality, to put it mildly. Although, one would have thought that the headline alone would have ensured an appropriate degree of fairness and sincerity.

"To see the discrepancy for yourselves, you need only turn to page 16 of Bulletin No 14 of the joint sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities for 25 September this year. I am again forced to quote, this time on my own behalf: 'There is no point laughing when the question of distributing weapons is raised. Try looking into the matter. The peoples created this country—the USSR—together, they have put their strength and resources into it. The country's national wealth should be distributed because it was created by the peoples—that is totally fair. I am not saying that the world will agree to our weapons being divided into 15 or perhaps even 53 parts, or that individual republics will acquire nuclear weapons—I would not want and would not contemplate such a thing. I would ask you to understand that this question will be raised and we should be prepared for it.' As we can see, the journalist's version is strikingly different from my own. Both as regards the facts and as regards the way the problem was raised.

[Signed] "USSR People's Deputy L.A. Arutyunyan."

From the editorial office: We are publishing in full the paragraph from the stenographic record of the deputy's speech discussed in the published letter. We ask readers to judge for themselves how the deputy is to be understood.

"...There is no point laughing when the question of distributing weapons is raised. Try looking into the matter. The peoples created this country—the USSR—together, they have put their strength and resources into it. The country's national wealth should be distributed, because it was created by the peoples—that is totally fair. I am not saying that the world will agree to our weapons being divided into 15 or perhaps even 53 parts, or that individual republics will acquire nuclear weapons—I would not want and would not contemplate such a thing. I would ask you to understand that this question will be raised and we should be prepared for it. You are representatives of the peoples and you cannot close your eyes to the fact that the peoples have created our country over the course of 70 years. That is why all the RSFSR's [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] claims to individually inherit what has been created in the Soviet Union and on RSFSR territory are groundless and could only lead to the ultimate elimination of the USSR as a state and as a Union. All attempts to infringe the rights of the peoples making up the USSR are doomed to failure."

Political & Social

CPSU Deputy Secretary Ivashko Interviewed

LD0511201890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1625 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Studio interview with Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of CPSU Central Committee, by Stanislav Pribylov; from "supplement" to the "Who's Who" program; live or recorded]

[Text] [Pribylov] Good evening. The chief editorial staff of Central Television's sociopolitical programs present a supplement to the program "Who's Who?" Participants from our previous broadcasts will be answering viewers' questions and letters which were received after the original broadcast. Today we have Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. We would like to start our talk today with questions which seem to me to be of principal significance.

Previously, the number two in the party was always an ideologist. Today we have an economist. Tell us, Vladimir Antonovich, what is this connected with—the main problem of transferring to the market, or with something else as well?

[Ivashko] I think that one's original profession is not very important for political work. An ideologist—what is an ideologist? An economist is closer to concrete work. I

think that if a person is engaged in politics then he should be involved in it. It should be, as far as possible of course, a more widely-educated person, familiar with ideology and economics and culture, and other aspects—although I certainly do not ascribe all of this to myself. But nevertheless that is how it should be. I think that at this point in time politics is the main thing.

[Pribylov] The question which has come up most frequently in viewers' letters which have been received since Vladimir Antonovich took part in our program concerns the main problem—the transfer to the market. Viewers ask: Is not the idea of a transfer to the market a departure from the final aim of the communist idea of building a society based on public ownership of means of production?

[Ivashko] Let us perhaps turn to the socialist idea itself at the beginning of our talk. You see, there is much talk now on this subject, about the communist ideal, about socialism, about devotion to the one and the other, about deviations from the one and the other. Perhaps I will start with this.

You know, the striving for a just society, for a society of happy people, can be traced virtually as a constant in the history of mankind, beginning with ancient Christianity, going on to learned Utopians, and beyond. And it is impossible to prevent this striving in man. It drives people's thoughts. And if we talk about socialism, then it is first and foremost a society built for man. It is a society of free people. Incidentally, this is pretty clearly stated in the program statement that was adopted at the 28th CPSU Congress. So if we are talking about a society of free people, is there a place for foisting whomsoever's will on other people. Providing, naturally, they do not break the law—that is, the norms of man's society. In my view there is no such place.

Undoubtedly one cannot consider as right, by my way of thinking, such approaches as, for example, if we touch on the peasant question. "Let's drive everyone into collective farms." That was violence, you see, on the individual. "Let's break up all collective farms in a tough way!" Isn't that the same kind of violence? It seems to me that a person should find his place himself, whether he should work in some kind of collective or whether he should work on his own. You see the market is, if you like, a simple expression of what always exists in society. It is a means for implementing trade and monetary relations, and no more than that.

Why is it that these mutual relations always existed in our country, no matter how some theoretician or other denies it? True, in this case, I must put the word theoretician in quote marks. Commodity-money relations did exist in our country both during the first years of Soviet power and to this very day. In what form they manifested themselves—this is indeed what we are talking about now. And I do not think that there is any

need here for ideological stereotypes which, after all, you know, add nothing either for society or for the people. This is what I would say.

[Pribylov] In many of your interviews and also in your speech at the latest [CPSU] plenum you said that the party is now abandoning its activities in the sphere of the national economy and economics. In that connection, here is one of the questions which worry many tv viewers and many party members and those who do not belong to the party. It is a question about the party's structure—rayon, town, kray committees. Some think it inexpedient to have such unwieldy party structures. They call it going back to what things were like yesterday.

[Ivashko] Well, on the point of the party abandoning economic activities, the party has abandoned the management of the economy and this process will continue. It is not up to us. It is altogether nonsense; a situation in which production is under the management of some sort of two or three parallel structures does not exist anywhere in the world. No one needs that. But, likewise, no one needs a party which does not have a social and economic policy of its own. This is the main thing. If a party does not have a social and economic policy it is simply an ordinary club where you can gather and chat about various more or less agreeable topics. Hence, if you talk of rayon and town committees as economic management bodies, then such bodies are, indeed, unnecessary. As bodies which implement the party's economic policy they are needed, of course, and they will exist simply to implement this policy. It is necessary to draw in people, as many as possible, essentially everyone and then there will be results. You know, policy is not made singlehandedly. That is why it is naive to count on there being, appearing, or otherwise coming on to the scene some individual who will resolve all the problems in the country. Things have never been like that and they will never be like that.

[Probylov] In our conversation we touched on the plenum, the last plenum. There are many questions from tv viewers who are interested in the plenum decisions and resolutions. One of them pertains to the formation of new commissions within the composition of the Central Committee. One of them is called the Commission to Renew the Activities of Primary Party Organizations. Could you tell us about the work of this commission in greater detail?

[Ivashko] Questions are being asked about what sort of a body is this. Will it not be some sort of directive and instruction issuing body, and so on? No, no! After all, the idea here is altogether different. The idea consists in the Central Committee members—not some sort of apparatus, but those who have been elected at the congress—in the group of these people being able, on the basis of moods, ideas, and experience gathered in primary party organizations of one kind or another, to gather everything that is best and provide feedback to primary party organizations.

[Pribylov] You said policy is not made singlehandedly. Mikhail Sergeyevich [Gorbachev] in his concluding speech at the plenum, spoke of and called for the necessity of uniting all the democratic and progressive forces in the country. Tell me, with what parties is the CPSU already cooperating in the multiparty conditions and with what parties is it yet to establish ties?

[Ivashko] We in the Central Committee have set up, for the first time—I think this is even the first time in the history of our party, that is what I think—we have set up even a section in charge of ties with other social and political groups. Does this mean we are ready to cooperate with everyone in the whole wide world without any exception. In my understanding no, it does not mean that.

There exist perfectly pronounced anticommunist forces which make it their goal to destroy communist ideas as such. What sort of cooperation can there be here? Well, recently a small group visited Moscow and went here and there. In some places they would say: Let us release the zoo animals and put communists in the cages instead. Why should I cooperate with them? Explain that to me.

It was, in my view, this group—or, perhaps, it was another group—that started saying that communists should be subjected to a sexual blockade. Well, who indeed is going to cooperate with such people on this score? Pardon me, but all this is on a level of a bad joke, nothing more. So, naturally, we have no intention of cooperating with such people and we generally have no wish to do so, nor do we need it, for it gives us nothing. In general it is, I would say, even humiliating to some extent, if you like, and I do not intend to cooperate with them.

But, let me say this again, as far as any other forces are concerned—forces which have other viewpoints on specific matters, but where there is something, there are points on which we can meet so as to resolve some problems, even specific ones—we are ready to cooperate with them. It is for this reason that even structural subunits are being created in the party, ones I talked about. The main thing is to have normal conversation, dialogue, debate. Maybe things will not immediately work out—well then, let us go our separate ways and then have another meeting. It is only in this way that life proceeds in a normal democratic society, and we are ardent supporters of this approach.

[Pribylov] Let us return to the plenum. At a press conference held after the plenum it was said that the plenum examined the question of combining the offices of the general secretary and of the president. This was explained by the fact that it is essential at the present stage. How does the party leadership explain this necessity?

[Ivashko] Well, I would not say that this matter has been examined, rather that it has been raised, it has been touched on. This matter is in the air, it exists, and we have proceeded from the fact that at this moment, this

very difficult time, such a combination of posts is quite simply essential. It is necessary both to the president himself, who as the leader of the party is able to rely on its backing, and is necessary to the party itself because the party, through the president, is able to realize various political approaches, shall we say. This, I think, is the main thing at the moment.

There is another aspect of the matter which we must take into account. The party that today has the majority of power naturally puts forward its own leader as the leader in power. You probably heard recently reports that Helmut Kohl remains the leader of his party. This...[Ivashko changes thought] Margaret Thatcher quite recently declared her loyalty to her party, in connection with the forthcoming elections. And that is how things go virtually all over the world.

[Pribylov] To use army language, you are the party's chief of staff; it is from the headquarters that all information proceeds, as we know. People are leaving the party, among them many politicians and leaders of local and even republican soviets. What is your forecast in this respect?

[Ivashko] In the first nine months of this year, 800,000 people left the party. That is a large number. Is it tragic for the party? As I understand it, no, it is not. This 19 million-strong party, which for decades has lived in conditions of political comfort, quite naturally fostered all sorts of people, both bolder types and, shall we say, people more worried about their own destiny; both those of a radical disposition and more conservative folk—the most diverse sorts of people. Let people choose their own destiny, that is their own affair.

There is something else that is of greater interest to me here: This very year, 80,000 were admitted as candidate members of the party, and after the 28th party congress, directly as full members; and somewhere around 170,000 people—I am rounding the figures a bit here, of course—rather more than 170,000 people became full members of the CPSU from candidate members of the party.

[Pribylov] In connection with the multiparty system, a situation frequently arises where someone who remains a member of the CPSU, possibly planning to leave the party ranks, is already organizing his own party, his own movement, and can sometimes be a member of two parties at once, the Communist Party and some other one. What is your opinion of someone like that, of such...

[Ivashko, interrupting] We have stated very precisely that one cannot be a member of two parties. There is the old joke about the man who joins two parties at once, counting on one of them eventually winning, so he would stay afloat, so to speak. We do not support that sort of enthusiast. So you must make your choice: Either join our party, or another.

It is quite another matter that a very great number of diverse movements exist in society. It is one thing to be

in two parties at once; but it is quite another for a communist to take part in one, two, or even ten public movements. The first option we regard as impermissible, the second is quite all right.

[Pribylov] Figures about the party budget were recently published. Many television viewers have asked about what needs this money goes to meet.

[Ivashko] Well, as regards the party budget and entrepreneurial activity—I'll slip this question in here in advance, since many people are talking about it at the moment—there is a great deal of talk about this at present, and all sorts of idle speculation on the subject. I do not wish to name specific publications, simply because we regard them as meriting no attention. This is just another psychological attack on the party through people's everyday consciousness. So the party is going to buy up virtually the whole of industry in the Soviet Union? Well, that, if you will pardon me, is verging on the idiotic. I can speak about this wholly responsibly, because the size of all this wealth of ours was made public in Comrade Kruchina's report at the 28th party congress, and since that time they have only diminished, because, for example, 500 million rubles [R] of our money has, as is known, been transferred to the Chernobyl Fund, in accordance with the decisions of the 28th CPSU congress.

Moreover, because of the reduction in party subscriptions income is being sharply curtailed. In effect there is not a single oblast party organization now which can survive on the money it is getting. And I read recently in some publication or other that it would supposedly be easy to escape the difficulties connected with the market if party funds were to be channeled to that end. I think that was written by a deputy in some soviet or other or in some such publication. But I worked out how much this would come to, from our funds as mentioned by Kruchina—and in fact they are even less now—if they were divided among the population of the Soviet Union. It came out to R16 a person. Well, I do not know how R16 would help you, so to speak, to provide a hedge for several years against the transition to the market, to safeguard your living standards. This is simply not a serious approach.

[Pribylov] One more question concerning the party's financial position. As is known, the party recently acquired a foreign currency account. How is foreign currency used?

[Ivashko] Until this year the party never had a foreign currency account. I want to state that with all responsibility so that you might know it. In practice the party has never had its own sources of foreign currency, with one exception—subscriptions from communists who were working abroad. And under the procedures which existed in the country such contributions did not come to the party but rather, as stipulated, they were brought together at government level to form a common spending pool. So, did the party need foreign currency or

not? It did. And now a new procedure for distributing foreign currency in the country has been established. Now, if you want foreign currency, then go and earn it. That is how our foreign currency account has come about. At present it contains somewhere in the region of R2 million, which is, we might say, an insignificant amount bearing in mind what is needed, because even our printing operation depends wholly on imported inks, for instance, which simply do not exist in this country. Or, say, film is needed or something else of the sort. So it goes without saying that two million, as money goes, is very little to work with, and the amount of money used on official trips abroad and in other places is minimal. That is how our affairs stand. Although, where financial affairs in general are concerned, as we shall be moving ever more rapidly into the market now, bear in mind that nobody will be answerable on these questions. It will be a matter of commercial, financial confidentiality. But given that as yet we are just at the start of that road I am giving you all these figures.

[At this point there is an interlude and the screen shows an unattributed quotation: Party workers should not determine where wheat is sown and how much of it, where steel is smelted and how much of it. But what use to anyone is a party which is incapable of proposing an effective solution to socioeconomic problems.]

[Pribylov] There was a time people would go, at the party's behest, to construction sites in other republics. Now, as a result of interethnic conflicts, their position has become more complicated. What is the party doing to help these people?

[Ivashko] The party is carrying out its nationalities policy. At the CPSU's 28th congress this policy was reflected in a special resolution. It is, you understand, one of the tragedies of our time. We will be compelled initially to endure calamities of one sort or another and we will then have to return to an alliance of peoples, a very strong alliance of people. This is historically predetermined. Incidentally, contemporary analysts, both ours and foreign ones, speak of this and they are very seriously into this matter. Taking the opportunity of this conversation of ours, I would like to ask people of various nationalities to bear this constantly in mind. All in all, we are all linked by one characteristic: We are all people. When we talk of the primacy, the priority of universal human values, we thereby reject any sort of superiority of one nation over another.

[Pribylov] Previously party workers alone addressed the working people at meetings, rallies, and demonstrations. Now we see representatives of various movements addressing meetings and demonstrations of all sorts of movements, societies, and associations. It is nice to see this expression of pluralism. It is a real result of the development of a multiparty system. All the same, when shall we see representatives of the CPSU and other democratic movements on one rostrum?

[Ivashko] I am aware of thousands of cases where people of most diverse world views, as it were, are standing side by side on one rostrum. It is only that one must now pay a bit more attention to the wording of names of all sorts of movements because, without exception or almost without exception, they are all called democratic in our country. We, likewise, regard ourselves as a very democratic organization. One will, in general, now have to seriously get to the bottom of who is left wing and who is right wing. I do not think that this is the main thing in our work. There are specialists, there are scientists. Let them get to the bottom of this. This is because, the way I see it, very many extreme right-wing elements now call themselves left wing, and vice versa. Well, I do not think that the matter revolves around definitions here. It is a part of our nature, this perpetual desire to get to the bottom of terminology, to indulge in stereotypes, and to label each other and so forth. But dialogue must be equal and here we have a thing or two to learn. Of course I do understand that rallies and mass movements entail outbursts of emotions. Emotions are one thing but laws must be observed along with elementary culture, as it were.

[Pribylov] Vladimir Ilich Lenin repeatedly warned communists that a split in the party means its de facto collapse. A process of division into layers is now taking place in the party according to specific views. In this context it is interesting to learn what the leadership thinks about the main correlation, as it were, of forces within the party now.

[Ivashko] Well, as for the reference to Lenin and the concept of split. Well, Lenin was saying this in conditions where the party had a certain numerical strength. We live in altogether different conditions. The history of the party under Lenin was different too, while now it is something else. And Lenin did not know, did not understand, and was surely unable to imagine for himself very many pages in the history of the party, pages which, as it were, were filled after him. As for the word split, here too certain well known stereotypes, if you like, are inherent. What is it?

The party now has people who, indeed, hold specific positions on many issues and we have already mentioned that. What would now be the simplest thing to do? To divide them up into categories and movements? I disagree with that. It would, again, mean going back. It would again be going back to seeing things in black and white. It is, in my view, precisely the renewed party that enables each person to express his views freely, to meet those who think like him. It is another matter if this takes on the form of an organization—this would surely be a different party and then these people would simply, as it were, have to go. But if these people are united around some platform or an idea, if they wish to prove something or other, is that not a sign of democracy within the party?

[Pribylov] Several times during our conversation we dwelt on the fact that today the gamut of views in society

is fairly broad, from the extreme right wing to the extreme left wing. Criticism of the government comes from both these extremes. As is known, it is the centrist governments which are the world's strongest governments. Tell us, what is the party doing now to strengthen the authority of the center and of the president?

[Ivashko] Take a look at the materials, let us say, of the selfsame October CPSU Central Committee plenum, the latest plenum. In my view, it contains the answers to these questions. I have in mind specific questions of market economy, and the report and particularly the plenum decision, contain these. I think these documents state with sufficient clarity what we are doing in this direction, as it were. It is our policy. It is our policy. But the president is the general secretary of our party and it is his policy.

[Pribylov] It is unfortunate that not all questions can be answered during the short time of our broadcast. I hope that Vladimir Antonovich will, possibly, find time to reply to those who have failed to receive an answer to questions of interest to them. With this I would like to end our program.

Army Mother Interviewed on Gorbachev Meeting
LD0511151990 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1230 GMT 5 Nov 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] On 7 November, mothers of soldiers who died during peacetime were planning to protest actions such as going on a hunger strike or blocking the movement of tanks on Red Square.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] After your meeting with Comrade Gorbachev, have you changed your mind to get into Red Square on 7 November and lie under the tanks?

[L.M. Lymer, from Chelyabinsk] Of course it has. Our children were killed twice—first physically, and then morally. We have nothing more to lose. We decided to stand up to the death for the honor and dignity of our sons. We were ready for anything, but, of course, the meeting somehow inspired the parents. It must be said that Mikhail Sergeyevich said that all our demands can be met. Timescales have been fixed. In the course of two weeks the matter of material compensation will be resolved. The matter of the commission itself will be resolved. In the very near future the matter will be resolved of issuing all parents a death certificate to the effect that our sons died while carrying out their duty.

I personally asked Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev—I said to him—Mikhail Sergeyevich, it is the 73d anniversary. You want to celebrate this holiday. Make it a holiday for the mothers whose children are in prison, who are under investigation. Mikhail Sergeyevich, issue a decree, quash all the... [changes thought] So that all the criminal cases are closed where our children, to save

their lives, were forced to voluntarily leave their units. To this proposal Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that it is possible. It could be done. But not as we demanded, by declaring an amnesty by 7 November releasing our children from prison. Well, they need up to the New Year to do this, and want to do it. I think that the majority of mothers will soon see their sons.

[Correspondent] Has the hunger strike has been called off?

[Lymer] Yes. Yes. After such a meeting and after such guarantees, and the working out of a mechanism for fulfilling our demands, we do not have the right not to believe the president. [end recording]

It is up to the president.

Moscow Party Chief Previews 7 Nov Rallies
PM0611102090 Milan L'UNITA in Italian
4 Nov 90 p 4

[Interview with Yuriy Prokofyev, Moscow City Party Committee first secretary, by Sergio Sergi; place and date not given]

[Excerpts] Moscow—He was just back from a meeting at the Congress building with the 3,000 officers and troops who will march in Red Square 7 November. In the heated atmosphere on the eve of this event the leader of Moscow's Communists, Yuriy Prokofyev, reaffirmed the Armed Forces' loyalty. He laughed at the rumors of a coup: "You do not announce the date of a coup in advance...." On the same day Nikolay Kalinin, commander of the capital's military district, gave reassurances that the military "deserves the trust placed in it," while Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov announced that there will be a meeting between Gorbachev and the military deputies.

[Sergi] But you, Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev, are the right person to tell us whether the threat of a coup d'etat has been averted, as people say it has...

[Prokofyev] I believe that it will not happen next Wednesday or the Wednesday after...

[Sergi] But why are these rumors occurring?

[Prokofyev] Because there is a widespread feeling of uncertainty within society, and some people still long for a return to the firm hand approach. Some people believe that any kind of authority is all right, as long as there is some kind of authority. I believe Italy too went through a period when tensions were nurtured by means of explosions. Here too similar attempts are being made.

[Sergi] Why are people talking about a coup d'etat, no less?

[Prokofyev] The rumors stem from our "new democrats." In every state the power is based on the Armed Forces, so the task that these forces set themselves is to drive a wedge between the state structures and the

Armed Forces. The aim of the so-called radicals is to replace the government—which they call the Ryzhkov-Gorbachev government—and subsequently to eliminate Gorbachev and the Supreme Soviet. So the aim is clear.

[Sergi] Is it Gorbachev's defeat that is desired?

[Prokofyev] We have discussed the fact that the aim now is to portray the Armed Forces as the defender of the Communist Party, that parades are a tradition created by Lenin and the Communists. At the meeting it was stressed that the Armed Forces are still the defenders of the homeland. Parades were held on Kremlin hill 610 years ago on the occasion of the victory over the Tartars on the Kulkovo battlefield. Peter the Great's regiments marched proudly in Red Square. Parades are an old Russian tradition, and it is a mistake to attribute them solely to the 1917 revolution. [passage omitted]

[Sergi] Do you consider it "inopportune" for people to demonstrate 7 November at alternative rallies to the one in Red Square?

[Prokofyev] It will be possible to demonstrate in the streets with different slogans, not just those praising the October Revolution. Our demands to the president, the government, and the Party will be chanted...

[Sergi] Could you tell me some of the slogans?

[Prokofyev] Here are some proposed by the grassroots and the citizens: "Yes to the ideals of October, no to anticommunism"; "Shame on the destroyers of socialism"; "Self-management, not privatization"; "No to Stalinism and Brezhnevism, yes to democracy and socialism"; "Civil accord, yes; civil war, no"; "No to lower living standards"; "No to unemployment." There will also be banners urging the president to restore order in the country and urging Prime Minister Ryzhkov to put an end to experiments involving the people.

[Sergi] Briefly, what do you intend to show?

[Prokofyev] The substance of most of the slogans is the reform of socialism versus capitalization.

[Sergi] You have not yet answered my question: Do you or do you not agree with the recommendation to postpone the other demonstrations?

[Prokofyev] The slogan of those initiatives is the defense of human rights, so they could take place on other days. I believe that these are moves to intensify the confrontation. On several occasions we have proposed marching together, albeit with different slogans...

[Sergi] So it will be like on May Day, when Gorbachev was forced to leave the mausoleum. What will happen Wednesday?

[Prokofyev] All three demonstrations have been authorized by the Moscow Supreme Soviet and have equal rights. Ours is based on recognition of the October Revolution. But let this be quite clear: Not everything

that happened subsequently can be attributed to that event. Starting with Stalin's repressions. In our opinion, socialist ideals remain a vital force, despite everything, and represent the direction in which the world community is moving. I am talking about the socialism based on mankind's universal values. The rest will go into the streets arguing that the socialist option is mistaken and that the revolution was a grave mistake in our people's life.

[Sergi] Are you afraid of incidents?

[Prokofyev] No. I have met with the organizers of the other rallies. As far as I know, nobody wants clashes. The rallies have been scheduled for different times and in different places. [passage omitted]

[Sergi] You criticized Gorbachev at the the latest Central Committee meeting. Why?

[Prokofyev] I criticized him because his presence within the party is not apparent, or not as apparent as it should be in the present phase. I can cite some specific examples: Gorbachev has not attended any party conferences apart from the Russian congress. I believe that he should have convened the Central Committee before the decision to transfer to the market economy, so that the people could know the party's thinking before, not after, the plans were examined.

[Sergi] You have changed your mind. Now you think that there should be a separation of posts, that Gorbachev should relinquish one of the two. The presidency or the party leadership?

[Prokofyev] At the moment the situation is such that the combination of posts is still necessary. I criticized Gorbachev precisely because he devotes insufficient attention to the party. I say that Gorbachev needs the party more than it needs him. I said this clearly: If Mikhail Sergeyevich wants the party's support he must devote more attention to it, because a presidency that does not rest on a political force cannot function.

[Sergi] You are not trying to tell me that the CPSU could act as a force in opposition to Gorbachev?

[Prokofyev] Why not? These are realities. The party must understand the general secretary and the latter must understand the party.

[Sergi] Do you make this criticism of Gorbachev because you consider him neglectful or because you have realized that he is now interested only in the presidency?

[Prokofyev] I do not know why. You would have to ask him. I have said, and I repeat: If he wants to enjoy the party's support he must refer to this party. The situation in society is changing: In the past the party followed the general secretary, whatever his actions and decisions. The result is that the CPSU has obtained what it has today, including the people's present attitude toward it. This too was implicit in my criticism. [passage omitted]

7 Nov Military Paraders Gather in Moscow

LD031122490 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1240 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 3 Nov (TASS)—A festive gathering of participants in the parade by troops of the capital's garrison, which will take place on 7 November, and is dedicated to the 73rd anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, took place in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses today. Colonel-General Nikolay Kalinin, commander of the troops of the Moscow military okrug, gave assurance that the participants in the parade would honorably live up to the confidence placed in them.

Three Moscow Demonstrations Planned

LD0611092590 Moscow TASS in English 0911 GMT
6 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondents Lev Aksenov and Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow November 6 TASS—In a break with tradition reflecting changing public sentiments, the Soviet capital will mark this year's October revolution anniversary with three public demonstrations instead of just one.

The military parade, however, will be held as usual.

The official walk will be staged by the City Communist Party Committee, the Komsomol and filial organisations in Red Square. The country's leaders are expected to attend.

The second march is being organised by the Democratic Russia Movement, Russia's Social Democratic Party, Free-Democrats and several other organisations.

While the first procession will celebrate the event, the second will mourn victims of repression during the past 70 years.

The third demonstration has been masterminded by a group of radical parliamentarians, including ousted prosecutors Telman Gdlyan and Nikolay Ivanov and former KGB General Oleg Kalugin.

The (?holding) of the two alternative marches points to a fledgling split in the ranks of the opposition.

The second demonstration will be attended by moderate democrats, while the third—by radicals, Lev Ponomarev of the Democratic Russia Movement told TASS.

Although the Presidium of the Soviet parliament has called on organisers of alternative marches to postpone them until after the official holidays, Moscow City authorities gave the green light, saying that all citizens should have equal rights to express their views.

Official Views 'Provocation'

LD0411103390 Hamburg DPA in German
0958 GMT 4 Nov 90

[Excerpts] Moscow (DPA)—Deputy head of the Moscow criminal investigation department (Yuriy Fedoseyev) has described the decision by the Moscow City Soviet to allow three demonstrations on the anniversary of the October Revolution on 7 November as a provocation. This measure will further exacerbate the already tense situation in the Soviet capital, Fedoseyev said in an interview today with DPA. [passage omitted]

"I do not think that the operational situation in Moscow on 7 November will be simple. This confrontation cannot lead to any good," Colonel (Fedoseyev) said. "I hope that on 7 November we shall have enough strength and patience to avoid excesses from one side or another." In any event the police intend to see to it that the consequences of such excesses remain minimal. The police have prepared for "certain variations and scenarios," (Fedoseyev) said.

Generals Comment on Parade

LD0311233290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Excerpt] [Correspondent Kim Kukholev] Hello comrades! Our program is going out on the eve of a holiday, the 73rd anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. To mark the anniversary there will, as always, be a military parade in Red Square. The first military parade of this kind was held on May Day, 1918. This forthcoming parade will be the 120th.

Previously there was never any dispute or controversy, so to speak, on the eve of military parades in the country's main square. But this year the situation is different. Some public organizations—or their representatives, at any rate—are totally opposed to the holding of military parades. They are not necessary, period. That's their view. Others are urging that the path of the military columns be blocked, and are voicing anti-Army slogans.

Well, how does the Ministry of Defense react to this? What do the participants in the parade themselves think about it? First of all, I will ask you to listen to an extract from a recording of a news conference which was held the other day at the press center of the Ministry of Defense. Questions from Soviet and foreign journalists were answered by three lieutenant-generals occupying high posts in the Moscow Military District: Generals Golovnev, Shcherbakov, and Burtsev. One of the questions raised was about the criticism of parades. [passage indistinct]

[Begin recording] [Unidentified speaker] Surely one cannot discount the importance of tradition. Our esteemed journalists are aware of the numerous precedents elsewhere in the world for the holding of parades. For example, you know about the parade held in France on 14 July. On that day the streets and squares of Paris

are filled with the rumble of military vehicles and the sound of military music. A fully-fledged parade is held there every year.

[Unidentified correspondent] I am from All-Union Radio, from the program: I Serve the Soviet Union. I want to pass on to you a question from one of our listeners. Will the officers taking part in the parade include non-Communists? Will the other ranks include soldiers who are not members of the Komsomol?

[Unidentified speaker] As in previous parades, the participants will include both non-Communists and non-members of the Komsomol. Such people will be manning vehicles in the mechanized section of the parade, and taking part in the march-past. We are not creating any obstacles or difficulties. This was the case with the first parade. The 120th parade will not break with this tradition.

[Second unidentified speaker] I would like to add that the men involved here have not been chosen in any special way, along party lines, for example. It's detachments which take part in the parade, as a rule. I repeat, detachments. For example, an entire regiment of the Kantemirskaya Division will be selected. Everybody serving in that regiment will take part in the parade.

[Third unidentified speaker] Maybe [words indistinct] questions, we do not discriminate along party lines. Representatives of all 15 Union republics in our country are taking part in the parade. No nationalities are excluded. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Patriarch Addresses Compatriots on GOSR

*PM0611121590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
6 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1*

[Patriarch Aleksiy II of Moscow and All-Russia "Message to Compatriots"; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The celebration of the latest anniversary of the October revolution now being prepared has given rise to various responses in society. The passions which flared up around 7 November are also not being interpreted by everyone in the same way. IZVESTIYA asked Patriarch Aleksiy II of Moscow and All-Russia to voice his attitude toward the forthcoming event. Following his pastoral duty, His Holiness accepted our request. Here is his message to his compatriots.

Brothers and sisters! It was 73 years ago that an event occurred which determined Russia's path in the 20th century. This path has been sorrowful and hard. Even today we cannot yet say that we have traveled it to the end.

But the spiritual and historical experience of the Church, the experience of the Holy Story, shows us that the path of ordeals will be lengthened if the people refuse to comprehend the spiritual purport of what is happening

and repeat previous errors. And this path will be shortened if people remember the prime sources and final purpose of their lives.

Christian thinking cannot be satisfied merely with analyzing the roles which particular political forces played in the development of the 1917 events. Establishing the degree of responsibility is not the main thing now: There is another Court. We shall look into our hearts.

You cannot change or bring back what has been done. But, in unfolding the annals of the past, we can feel more clearly the Will which even now is blazing a trail through a thousand interwoven chances and deeds. Should we not, after over 70 years, like an old and wise man, look back and see that there are no "redundant" pages in the life of a man or in the life of a people. Shall we recall that 1917 was not a redundant page in Russia's history? Not redundant, not empty, not pointless. Yes, a bitter page. Yet, as the Holy Scripture says, "although affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring from the ground" (Job, 5, 6).

We will still have to consider for a long time the diseases from which that affliction grew and which brought Russia to that brink. We shall have to spend even longer eliminating many of them.

But today, as then, surely we can see that the spirit of division and frenzy is taking possession of our souls? Again people are opposing "theirs" to "other people's." And they regard "theirs"—their position, property, or ideas—as more valuable than "other people's" not ideas, but lives!

But let October 1917 remind us that there is no political, national, or cultural idea whose value exceeds the value of a human life. Let October 1917 remind us that the people's unity can easily be split but afterward you have to put it together again, cutting off parts of the living body which had seemed "superfluous." And may all the past years arise in our conscience one after another and implore us not to pay with human destinies for the experiments and principles of politicians.

I ask you, dearly beloved, that this day become not a day of celebration and not a day of imprecations, but a day of thought. The kind of thought which springs from the depths of our conscience and forces us to look anew at every person, discovering anew a brother in him.

Perhaps this day will some time become a day of conciliation. Yes, it is probably impossible to reconcile ideas and assessments. But the road to peace—to a world without hatred—is never closed to people.

Do not allow the spirit of hatred among brothers and of vindictiveness to call the tune in Russia! "See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil" (Ephesians, 5, 16), and "as we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men" (Galatians, 6, 10).

And to those who will be able, I ask: Join my prayer and the prayer of the Church:

Lord, teach, renew, and preserve our people for "in trouble have they visited thee, they poured out a prayer when thy chastening was upon them" (Isaiah, 26, 16).

Republic Movements Form Coordinating Council

LD0311184190 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1434 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Nov (TASS)—The numerous movements that exist in the USSR favoring the preservation of the political and economic integrity of the country, with respect for the rights of national minorities, and which are known by the name of Internationalist Fronts, have created a common leading body. This decision was adopted at the "Intermovements: State and Outlook for Their Activists" scientific and practical conference which concluded in Moscow today. Taking part in the work of the meeting were representatives of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Moldova, West Ukraine, the republics of Central Asia, and people's deputies who are members of the "Soyuz" parliamentary group.

There was more than one instance of concern in the speeches of the movements' representatives at the growth in anti-Russian attitudes in the republics and the fanning of interethnic and political tension. There was fairly frequent criticism of the Supreme Soviet, president, and prime minister of the USSR, who have, in the view of the Interfront members, taken a poorly defined stance on these matters.

The internationalist movements, the conference noted, should not act without coordination, as has been the case so far, but as a single front. It is precisely this objective, the organizers said at a meeting with journalists, that is pursued by the creation of the Central Coordinating Council (CCC). The CCC will not have a single person at its head. The Intermovements will be run by its cochairmen. Moreover, clearly realizing the importance of immediate action, the participants in the Moscow conference concluded that it would not be expedient at present to hold an all-Union Intermovement congress.

Soviet General Denies Coup Being Planned

PM0511155690 Paris LE FIGARO in French
3-4 Nov 90 p 2

[Interview with Soviet General Dmitriy Volkogonov by Laure Mandeville in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] Moscow—[Mandeville] The Soviet Union is passing through a period of confusion in which power is being dissipated. If the mistakes continue and chaos spreads the army could intervene. Can a military coup be envisaged?

[Volkogonov] I am expressing my viewpoint as a scientist, it is not an official viewpoint: There will be no coup d'etat. The army will remain loyal to the government and to the president. It is experiencing very serious problems. Moreover, it would have been surprising for the army to remain healthy in a sick society. But it is also the only remaining stable structure in the system—the one which is least affected by disintegration. Nobody is planning a coup d'etat. Sensation-seeking journalists are chasing rumors. But after 40 years in the army I know many high-ranking military. There is no plot. You can believe me.

[Mandeville] If the struggle between Yeltsin and Gorbachev grows fiercer what will the army's position be?

[Volkogonov] That is not a good question. It is irresponsible to ask such questions.

[Mandeville] Even if the military do not intervene directly in the political process, they have influence. What message are they trying to convey to the political authorities?

[Volkogonov] All the armies in the world—the French Army, the U.S. Army, and of course the Soviet Army—are the most conservative elements in societies. The army cannot be turned into a debating club. It would no longer be an army. In our country the party is still on the scene and does not want to withdraw. I advocate keeping the army out of politics. It must be the instrument of the state, the government, and the president. Remember the events of May 1968: The army was placed on alert by General de Gaulle. What the army wants is for order to be restored, for an end to these interminable meetings, this amorphous political process, and the reign of non-government. But it wants this without having to intervene. Order must be established in the framework of democracy.

[Mandeville] A question regarding the army's stance on the empire: Where do the military think Soviet strategic space ends?

[Volkogonov] Our army had an offensive doctrine. This doctrine must be reviewed because our army has returned to national borders. It was in Afghanistan and in Eastern Europe. A defensive doctrine must be established. I think that the army should not have any internal role and the majority of the military share my viewpoint.

[Mandeville] What do you think of the emergence of national armed forces within the Union?

[Volkogonov] That would be a big step backward. If armed forces were formed in the Ukraine, Georgia, or Moldavia, that would mean a return to the nineteenth century. On the eve of the twenty-first century the whole of Europe is uniting and pulling down barriers. Why should we create barriers, borders, and armed forces?

[Mandeville] Can the army conceive of losing parts of its strategic space, like the Baltic regions, or the Caucasus?

[Volkogonov] The USSR still exists. There is a chance of preserving it either in the form of a renewed federation or in the form of a community of republics. There are still chances that the majority of republics will accept joint armed forces—smaller, but joint. The official secession of the republics has not been accepted either by the president or by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The army therefore includes all the territories of all the republics in its strategic space.

[Mandeville] Many observers compare the USSR's present situation to that which prevailed in Russia between February and October 1917. What do you think?

[Volkogonov] Historical analogies are always rather dangerous. It is true that 1917 has some points in common with the present period. But there are also major differences. The main reason for the failure of the February Revolution and the violent outcome of October 1917 is that there was no strong liberal-democratic center. The situation is somewhat similar now. There is no strong center. There is a tough conservative right composed of the old government and administrative apparatuses, and on the other side there are many very different democratic movements. Therefore the risk of a confrontation between the extremes remains.

Gorbachev Greets Nongovernmental Commission

LD0311225190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1600 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] Peace and food, these two fundamental concepts and symbols are organically combined in the name of an international nongovernmental commission which met today in Moscow. Its members are prominent scholars, public figures, and experts from more than 20 countries. The participants in the session were greeted by Academician Nikonov, president of Lenin All-Union Agricultural Sciences Academy, who passed on best wishes for successful work from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, head of the Soviet state. A thorough discussion will be held at the session on the granting of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics consultative assistance in the setting up of joint enterprises and the use of conversion of the military-industrial complex for the resolution of the food problem.

Yazov Meets With Armed Forces' Deputies

LD0311151790 Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT
3 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow November 3 TASS—Problems faced by the Soviet Armed Forces should be solved "in public, without concealing anything from the people", Soviet Defence Minister Dmitry Yazov told TASS after his meeting today with servicemen of all ranks, who are members of parliament.

"We should continue to inform Soviet people about all measures taken by Soviet Defence Ministry senior executives to solve pressing and, sometimes, painful issues related to current transformations in the Army and Fleet," Yazov said.

Yazov said he informed deputies about problems which senior executives of the Defence Ministry have to tackle during the present reform in the armed forces, the difficulties that emerged during the transition to a market economy and the servicemen's interests affected by the reform.

According to Yazov, deputies concentrated on issues related to reductions in the armed forces and armaments, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from East European countries and Mongolia and social safeguards for servicemen and their families.

"The meeting passed in an exceptionally frank and friendly atmosphere," Yazov noted. He thinks that deputies expressed their full commitment to the idea of strengthening the socialist statehood, the multi-ethnic homeland. All speakers at the meeting emphasised the need to preserve the Union Army. They said it's division into republican armies would weaken the state.

Deputies put the question of the need for their meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. "I think he will agree to this meeting," Yazov said.

Central Committee Obtains Greater Role

91UN0180B Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Report on interview with CPSU Central Committee Member Leonid Fedorovich Shukaylov by PRAVDA correspondents A. Simurov and A. Ulitenok, in Nosovichi; date not given: "Elected a member of the CPSU Central Committee: Not Hoping for a Miracle"]

[Text] Gomel Oblast—We had no prior arrangement for a meeting with L. Shukaylov, but drove to Nosovichi all the same, being in no doubt that it would take place. From what did our confidence stem? We knew that Leonid Fedorovich had been the head of a school for 30 years, and, this being the case, where would he be if not at hearth and home?

The local 10-year school is one of the best not only in remote Dobrushskiy Rayon—it is known to the whole republic. It was no accident that his colleagues elected Shukaylov a delegate to the recent All-Union Education Workers Congress. The local party members gave their vote to Leonid Fedorovich also, electing him delegate to the 28th congress from a district in which four persons were running.

Many people speak of the high authority of the new member of the CPSU Central Committee. But the most interesting description, perhaps, was that of V. Lavri-nenko, director of the "Nosovichi" Pedigree-Breeding Farm, whom we found in the school itself:

"I was recommended for the state farm last year. I will say frankly: I hesitated. The choice was determined by the executive V. Petrovskiy, who is respected in the district: 'Stick with Shukaylov, listen to what he has to say, and everything will be all right.' And, indeed, Leonid Fedorovich's disinterested support helped me blend into the work force and become my own man. When he was elected to the party Central Committee, we all sincerely rejoiced: It is such people who are capable of rallying around them all who are looking for a way out of the impasse."

what does Shukaylov himself think? How is he entering into his new role?

[Shukaylov] First of all, I am aware of the inordinately high responsibility. And I understand very well that the introduction to the Central Committee of me, a rural teacher, and also other candidates, and the broadening of the so-called 'rank and file' representation, are a practical step toward the consolidation and renewal of the party and evidence of its capacity for self-reform.

It is now apparent to all of us that prior to the 28th congress the Central Committee had played by no means the main part in determination of both the tactics and strategy of the CPSU. It was not fortuitous that at the first plenum of the new Central Committee M.S. Gorbachev said that many new, most interesting and diverse ideas had already been engendered within the walls of the meeting hall, which had seen some things in its time, but that they had frequently died here also.... For the highest, final authority had been the Politburo. I am convinced that the times now are different. And the CPSU Central Committee, which broadly represents the interests of millions of communists who are familiar at first hand with the hopes, concerns, and aspirations of the whole people, will now become the principal body in the formulation of party policy.

Incidentally, at the time of the adoption of the CPSU Rules I handed to the secretariat a written request proposing the formulation of a fundamental proposition concerning democratic centralism such that local undertakings and initiatives take precedence over the opinion of the center. The real supremacy of the party masses cannot be secured without this.

[PRAVDA] Leonid Fedorovich, you have spoken about the plenum, but omitted your impressions of the congress. Yet, as it seemed from the outside, it was there that those same members of the Politburo were for the first time in many years held to a really exacting account. Was this not so?

[Shukaylov] Yes, the process of the transfer of real power from the apparatus of the top party leadership to the congress, to the Central Committee, began with satisfaction of the delegates' demands concerning personal reports from our leaders. Of course, there was much exaggeration and, at times, demagoguery too in the questions and heckling comments from the floor and in the written inquiries. But this was not in its deepest

essence an attempt to 'mark' Yakovlev, Ligachev, or Medvedev but a sincere desire to understand why previously the voice of the party masses had not been heard upstairs on the acute, urgent problems of our society. The Belorussian delegation, in particular, insisted on the adoption of a separate, albeit belated, impartial, honest resolution on the causes and consequences of the catastrophe at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station.

As a new member of the Central Committee, I learned from this keen dialogue the following lesson: You and your comrades should do everything to ensure that in the plane of creative constructivism the scenario and spirit of the congress in five years' time will be completely different. For this we need in forthcoming practical activity to constantly check with the opinion of the primary organizations. Responsibility for the country's emergence from the crisis situation is, after all, with us a common responsibility—of the communist rank and file, myself, a member of the Central Committee, and the general secretary. Incidentally, Gomel sent us off to Moscow with a typical slogan: 'Defend Gorbachev!' Generally, I am for a strong alliance of people acting together. Enough of talk about the pluses and minuses of the like-mindedness which was played through for years, it is time to have done with dogmatic teachings and incantations. We need to confirm in deeds the proclaimed transition from the authoritarian-bureaucratic system to a society of humane, democratic socialism.

[PRAVDA] You put it well: an alliance of common action. Have you had a chance to make the acquaintance of any members of the Central Committee and convince yourself that this person is an ally, that one could get down to business with him?

[Shukaylov] You bet! Fellow countrymen primarily, of course. Now during meetings with various audiences one hears from time to time the rebuke: There are quite a few apparatchiks in the Central Committee. Excuse me, I say. Let us judge not indiscriminately but personally. Take, for example, our first secretary of the Gomel Oblast Party Committee, A. Grakhovskiy. When, four years ago, he learned about the explosion in Chernobyl and realized how this threatened the inhabitants of nearby farms, he made the decision to evacuate people immediately. Although he knew that only Moscow had the right to issue such a command. Nonetheless, this 'apparatchik' did not stop to think either about his career or his health: He worked around the clock at that torrid time, right in the thick of it, such that blood came spurting from his throat. They wanted to take him to hospital, but he would have none of it. He stayed to the end together with the Braginskiy kolkhoz [collective farm] members. So Aleksandr Adamovich is my ally.

I also consider, for example, O. Shenin, new secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the Politburo, to be such. How did I make his acquaintance? On the second day of the plenum we were virtually the first to arrive at the Kremlin. He turned to me and asked if I minded if he smoked. We fell into conversation. Oleg

Semenovich did not conceal his excitement: He had been nominated the evening before, but the vote had been deferred to the morning, and he had not slept the whole night through. I learned from the lengthy conversation that this person is sincerely concerned for the fate of the party and the country. I liked his unfeigned, lively interest in the state of affairs in the Belorussian party organization.

In general, interesting people have been selected for the CPSU Central Committee, in my opinion. And it is good that normal human relations, in which the needless undercurrent of subordination has been cast out completely, are taking shape among us.

[PRAVDA] The working bodies of the Central Committee have yet to be elected. What would you prefer for yourself?

[Shukaylov] I have no doubts on this score—I would like to be involved with ideology. Social science is my profession. I am currently encountering almost daily a new interpretation of customary facts, phenomena, and processes. I am observing with my own eyes, as they say, changes in the social consciousness and the molding of the new thinking. It is a pity that the theoretical, ideological comprehension of the far-reaching changes in people's mentality and their way of life is lagging behind urgent requirements of the times.

For this reason I would like to work in this most important area of the party's activity. Amplifying my position, I would say, for example, that, as I understand it, so-called pure ideology, to which some prompters are pushing the party, is a fable of the first degree and an abstract slogan. Only ideas that take account of actual socioeconomic conditions and are fed by the deep-seated sap of the traditions and culture of the people and their perception of the world are viable.

I would propagandize the material of the congress to the best of my ability. Now, when our opponents are endeavoring to downplay its significance, it is important to acquaint people with the actual essence of the adopted documents and show convincingly that CPSU policy is constructive and geared to the defense of the interests of each working man.

[PRAVDA] And the final question, Leonid Fedorovich: What are your school plans?

[Shukaylov] Up to September I had to live with the concerns of a real mundane works superintendent, trying to complete the construction of a new school building. But further down the road the most difficult part will begin: restructuring of the teaching and educational process and vocational instruction. I dream of doing it in accordance with the basic fields for our village, proceeding from the boys' propensities and interests. In a word, I see before me not simply a school but a kind of lyceum with the particular features of a national school. The public education system in Belorussia has for many decades attached insufficient significance to them, from

which many of today's problems spring.... The main task is the same as before—education of the personality. But the content of the process itself is, as you can see, changing and being cardinally renewed. We will work differently also, relying on our capabilities and energy and not hoping, as we used to do, for a miracle.

Commission Examines Multiparty Relations

91UN0180A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
27 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

[O. Akulova report: "En Route to Civil Accord"]

[Text] The first meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Sociopolitical Commission has been held.

The very first item on the agenda emphasized the most urgent of today's problems—concerning the CPSU's relations with other political parties and public movements and organizations. It is difficult, perhaps, to calculate how many of them there are in our country! Approximately 20 organizations with all-Union structures have announced their presence as of this time. An appreciable influence on the development of political processes is being exerted by the popular fronts, national movements, and various committees, unions, and associations.

Multiparty conditions, which have really emerged, have exacerbated the political situation. A veritable stew of ideas, slogans, theories, and ambitions has appeared. An acute competitive struggle of various groups for leadership has emerged. The fact that the weather vane of many currents is turning in the direction of anticommunism and antiparty sentiments is dangerous. Blocs with far-reaching ideological and political goals are being formed. Demands for a public trial of the party and the outlawing of the CPSU and the nationalization of its property are being made. At the recent constituent congress of the "Democratic Russia" movement the demand for the immediate resignation of the Gorbachev-Ryzhkov government was made the first point of the resolution.

"It is essential to take a sober look at the situation and the party's capacity for adapting to the new conditions," V.A. Kuptsov, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Sociopolitical Commission, said, opening the meeting. "And the reality is such that many party committees at all levels have proven helpless in the first clashes with the budding new public forces and have lost the initiative."

It is the commission's task to formulate strategy and tactics in the social and political sphere. Party workers, scholars, specialists, and field workers have been enlisted in its work. The very first meeting emphasized the need to seek civil and national accord. Objectively, the ideas of the renewal of our society, the ideas of perestroika, unite the CPSU with the majority of new forces. The art of political maneuver, compromise, a search for allies, and work with the social and political organizations and,

what is most important, active participation in the activity of the soviets take pride of place here, the meeting emphasized.

"It is essential to take the initiative," L.V. Galkin, member of the Sociopolitical Commission and general director of the "Zvenigorod" Association of Moscow Oblast's Odintsovskiy Rayon, said, "switch to the offensive, enter into dialogue with our political opponents, and strive for extensive glasnost."

This is a very pertinent observation if it is considered that the forces in opposition to the CPSU are making extensive use for propaganda of their ideas of both the official mass media and more than 300 of their own, quite prominent periodical publications with a circulation of up to tens of thousands of copies.

The need for communists' open dialogue with the representatives of other public forces was noted by many other participants in the meeting also. And there are opportunities for this. A social and political club, which is located at entrance 16 of the CPSU Central Committee and which performs the role of a center for contacts with representatives of the new parties, movements, fronts, civic initiatives, and the press, has been formed. Leaders of the reform currents—the Marxist and Democratic Platforms in the CPSU—met with the press there recently.

"We need not move toward accord and compromise with just any social and political party," A.A. Prigarin, member of the commission and director of the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems All-Union Research Center for the Organization of Labor, observed, "and it must be understood that the struggle is switching from the political sphere to a struggle for power. We should not put up with unconcealed attacks on and defamation of the CPSU. Each such attack should be rebuffed."

Granted all our aspiration to civil accord, the meeting observed, it is essential to proceed toward a complete severance of relations with antisocialist and separatist formations and the antiparty opposition.

In several hours of work the commission probably did not skirt around a single serious issue. Its position will be reflected in the political document "The CPSU's Relations With Other Political Parties, Public Movements, and Organizations."

CPSU Military Commission Members Listed

PM0211155990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Composition of CPSU Central Committee Commission on CPSU Military Policy"]

[Text] O.D. Baklanov,
secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, commission chairman.

Commission Members

- P.M. Abdurakhmanov,
first secretary of Samarkand Uzbek Communist Party Obkom [Oblast Party Committee], Samarkand;
- S.V. Aleksandrov,
radio apparatus and instrument tuner at the USSR Ministry of Communications' "Almaz" Production Association in Rostov, Rostov-na-Donu;
- V.A. Achalov,
commander of airborne assault troops, Moscow;
- B.S. Batalin,
party committee secretary at the USSR Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry's "Yantar" Shipyard, Kaliningrad;
- O.O. Burdenko,
general director of the USSR Ministry of Communications' 60th Anniversary of October Production Association in Vilnius, Vilnius, Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic];
- V.A. Vashurin,
radio apparatus tuner at the "Punane Ret" Plant of the USSR Ministry of Communications' Tallinn Electronic Equipment Production Association, Tallinn, Estonian SSR;
- A.K. Grigoryev,
diesel engine engineer at a locomotive depot, Daugavpils, Latvian SSR;
- A.I. Gromoglasov,
first secretary of Arkhangelsk CPSU Obkom, Arkhangelsk;
- G.I. Deryabin,
leader of a ship repair workers' team at the USSR Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry's "Nerpa" Ship Repair Works, Murmansk-60, Snezhnogorsk;
- G.R. Ibragimov,
drilling worker at the "Kaspmorneftegaz" Production Association's "Neftyanyye Kamni" Offshore Administration, Baku, Azerbaijan SSR;
- G.L. Karunin,
deputy commander of a military unit, Yoshkar-Ola;
- Yu.V. Kuznetsov,
general director of the "Prikaspiyskiy Gorno-Metallurgicheskiy Kombinat" Production Association, Mangistauskaya Oblast, Kazakh SSR, Shevchenko City;
- V.S. Kulikov,
milling machine operator at the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry's S. Ordzhonikidze Aviation Production Association in Gorkiy, Nizhniy Novgorod;
- M.V. Leonchenko,
party committee secretary at the USSR Ministry of the Defense Industry's "Permskiy Mashinostroitelnyy Zavod im. F.E. Dzerzhinskogo" Production Association, Perm;
- M.A. Moiseyev,
chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, Moscow;
- L.L. Nikiforov,

general director of the USSR Ministry of Communications' S.P. Korolev Production Association in Kiev, Kiev, Ukrainian SSR;

V.A. Prudnikov,
commander of Moscow Air Defense District, Moscow;

A.M. Raylyan,
deputy commander of a helicopter regiment, Carpathian Military District;

Yu.R. Rusakov,
captain of the "Mikhail Kalinin" diesel vessel at the Western Siberia River Steamship Company's Novosibirsk base, Novosibirsk;

Yu.P. Semenov,
general designer at the USSR Ministry of General Machine Building's "Energiya" Science and Production Association, Moscow Oblast;

G.A. Khvatov,
commander of the Pacific Fleet, Vladivostok;

Ye.S. Khilchenko,
assembly worker at the USSR Ministry of the Defense Industry's "Tulskiy Oruzheynny Zavod" Production Association, Tula;

Ye.I. Shaposhnikov,
commander in chief of the Air Force, Moscow;

N.I. Shlyaga,
chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, Moscow;

D.T. Yazov,
USSR defense minister, Moscow;

Ye.I. Yarkin,
leader of a team of shipwrights at the USSR Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry's A.M. Gorkiy Zelenodolsk Plant, Zelenodolsk, Tatar ASSR [Autonomous SSR].

Draft Instruction on CPSU Elections

91UN0190B Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Oct 90 Second Edition p 3

["Draft Instruction on the Procedure for Elections to the CPSU and Recall from Elective Organs"]

[Text]The proposed draft instructions were prepared in keeping with the instructions of the 28th CPSU Congress. The secretariat of the Central Committee and the presidium of the CPSU Central Audit Commission asks communists and all who are interested in these documents to direct their remarks and suggestions directly to the Central Committee or the Central Audit Commission of the CPSU or to some other party committee.

General Provisions

1. Management organs, except for party meetings, and executive and control organs in the party are elective.
2. Report and election meetings of primary and shop party organizations elect party bureaus, and in party organizations which have less than 15 party members they elect secretaries and their deputies. Party committees are elected at meetings or conferences in primary party organizations which have within their structure

shop organizations with the rights of primary organizations with regard to issues of membership in the CPSU. At the discretion of communists, audit (inspection) commissions are elected in primary party organizations at meetings and conferences. Party group organizers and, if necessary, their deputies are elected in party groups.

Rayon, city, district, oblast, kray, and republic party conferences of autonomous republics and congresses of Communist Parties of Union republics elect the corresponding committees and audit commissions.

Secretaries of party committees of all levels and chairmen of audit commissions are simultaneously elected as members of these organs at the corresponding meetings, conferences, and congresses or, at the discretion of the delegates, at plenums of party committees and audit commissions.

In the event of the departure of secretaries of party committees or chairmen of audit commissions during the period between reports and elections, their reelection takes place at plenums of the corresponding elective organs unless the conference (congress) has envisioned another decision.

3. Report and election meetings, conferences, and congresses are conducted upon expiration of the terms of office of the executive and audit organs they have elected:

—in primary and shop party organizations with less than 15 party members and party groups—at times established by meetings of communists, and in other primary and shop party organizations—once every two or three years;

—in rayon, city, district, oblast, kray, and republic party organizations of autonomous republics—once every five years.

The central executive and audit organs of the Communist Parties of the Union republics are elected for a period established by their congresses, and the CPSU Congress—once every five years.

Report and election meetings, conferences, and congresses are authorized if no less than two-thirds of the members of the party organization or elected delegates are present at them.

4. Party committees and audit commissions may be elected (fully or in part) through direct delegation of CPSU members by lower organizations. These organizations have the right to recall or replace their representatives. The procedure for electing party committees and audit organs in these cases is determined by the higher party committee on the basis of decisions by primary and local party organizations, and the authority of the delegated members of the elective organ is confirmed at the corresponding meeting, conference, or congress.

Elections of Delegates to Conferences and Congresses

5. Elections of delegates to conferences of primary party organizations and rayon, and city (without rayon division) party conferences are conducted at meetings of communists in their primary (shop) party organizations.

Delegates to city, district, oblast, kray, and republic party conferences, congresses of communist parties of the Union republics, the all-Union conference, and the CPSU Congress are elected by a direct vote of communists in their party districts or party conferences that comprise organizations.

Party districts can have single or multiple mandates. They are formed within the primary, rayon, and city party organizations or on the basis of their unification into districts in keeping with the established norm of representation.

6. The procedure for electing delegates and the norms of representation at conferences and congresses are determined by the corresponding party committee, taking into account the suggestions of primary and local party organizations. Decisions regarding this are made no later than two months before the conference and three months before the congress. When determining the procedure for electing delegates, the party committee proceeds from the idea that the delegates must be nominated by primary party organizations. In order to conduct elections in the districts the party committee forms election commissions and organizes the elections of delegates or instructs the lower party committees to do this work.

When elections are conducted in the districts the corresponding party committees, with the agreement of the party organizations, may reserve some of the mandates (no more than 10 percent) for the election of delegates directly at the conferences and congresses.

Nomination and Discussion of Candidates in Elections of Executive and Audit Organs

7. At their meetings and conferences primary party organizations have the right to make suggestions about candidates to the higher executive and audit organs, which are considered by the conference or congress to form the corresponding organs. These proposals are brought up for discussion by the conference of representatives of delegations. Special commissions made up of delegates may be formed for their preliminary study and generalization.

In the primary party organizations when candidates are nominated for party committees and audit commissions, the suggestions of shop party organizations, party groups, and communists are considered. A preliminary discussion of candidates for party committees and audit commissions is conducted in the party mass media.

Submitting proposed candidates for the new party organ on behalf of the conference of representatives of delegations (commission) does not restrict the rights of the

meeting participants and the delegates to nominate other candidates at the same meeting, conference, or congress, including themselves.

8. Party committees and control commissions, taking into account the opinions of the primary and local party organizations, can establish a quota principle for submitting candidates for executive and audit organs and, in keeping with this, can determine the quotas for organizations and the procedure for nominating candidates. The right to make changes in the candidates nominated at the meeting, conference, or congress is granted to delegations from the corresponding party organizations. The final decision on the candidates nominated according to the quota principle remains with the meeting, conference, or congress. In the event that the number of candidates nominated exceeds the established quota, this list is included on the ballot with an indication of the party organization and its quota.

9. Before the elections are held the party meeting, conference, or congress first determines the quantitative composition of the party organ to be elected.

Decisions of the meeting, conference, or congress related to the determination of the quantitative composition, the closing of nominations, and the discussion of candidates for the elective party organ are made by open voting.

Candidates may be nominated for the elective party organ from among party members who are not delegates to the party conference or congress, and also communists who are not registered in the given organization.

10. At their sessions, participants in the meeting and delegates to the conference or congress discuss all the nominated candidates. Each participant in the meeting or delegate to the conference or congress has an unlimited right to criticize and withdraw nominated candidates. The withdrawal of candidates is put to a vote. Individuals may withdraw their own names without a vote unless a vote is demanded by no less than one-fifth of the participants in the meeting, conference, or congress.

After the discussion of the candidates, the meeting, conference, or congress, by a simple majority, makes a decision on the individual candidates who are to be included on the ballot (list) for the elections.

Procedure for Voting and Totaling the Results of Elections

11. Elections to management, executive, and audit organs within the party are conducted by secret vote. Open voting may be used to elect deputy secretaries of the party bureau (party committee) or primary (shop) party organization at a meeting of the corresponding bureau (party committee), and also the secretary and his deputy in party organizations with less than 15 communists, and party group organizers—in party groups unless the meeting (conference) makes a different decision.

The ballot (list) for voting may include any number of candidates.

12. In order to conduct a secret vote or to tally its results, the party meeting, conference, congress, the plenum of the party committee, and the audit (inspection) commission elect a report commission by an open vote. The report commission selects a chairman and a secretary and prepares the ballots (lists) for secret voting on which the candidates are arranged in alphabetical order. When party conferences and congresses are conducted the positions and work places of the candidates are also indicated on the ballots for elections of party committees and audit commissions. The ballot boxes are sealed and installed in such a way that the communists go toward them through the booth (booths) for secret voting.

When voting is conducted in party organizations with less than 15 party members and in party groups, the party meeting may entrust the counting of votes to the chairman of the meeting and one of the party members.

13. In collectives which have a multishift work schedule or are spread over a large territory, the discussion of the reports and the nomination and discussion of candidates for the new party organs may be conducted at meeting of communists on the various shifts or at group meetings of several shop party organizations. From the results of the discussion a unified list is drawn up to conduct the elections by secret vote, which is held in the shift (group) party meetings.

A separate report commission is elected at each of the shift (group) meetings and the general counting of votes takes place at a joint meeting of all the report commissions. The results of the vote are reported to the communists at shift (group) or shop party meetings.

14. Each party member at a meeting, delegate at a conference, or member of a party committee or audit commission participating in the plenum receives one copy of the ballot (list) with the names of candidates nominated for the elective party organ.

Each individual participating in secret voting at the meeting, plenum, conference, or congress has the right to cross out the names of candidates on the ballot and add new ones, regardless of the number one party organ or another intended to elect in the first place.

In competitive elections for one mandate ballots with the name of no more than one candidate remaining are considered valid.

15. The vote counting commission reports to the meeting, plenum, conference, or congress the results of the secret vote for each candidate individually.

The report from the vote counting commission on the results of the secret vote is approved by the meeting, conference, congress, or plenum of the party committee and the audit commission. In cases where no vote counting commission is formed, the results of the vote are entered into the minutes of the meeting.

16. Candidates are considered elected if they have won more than half of the votes of the CPSU members participating in the voting at the meeting or plenum of the party committee, audit commission, conference, or congress. The number of participants in the voting is determined from the number of ballots in the boxes.

17. If the vote results in the election of more or less members than were initially established, the meeting, conference, or congress may decide by open vote to approve the new number of members of the party organ—in keeping with the results of the secret vote.

If the previously established number of members of the party organ does not change but fewer are elected, it is necessary to nominate candidates for the free mandates and conduct a secret vote on them. But if more than the established number of candidate have been selected for the elective organ, then when determining the results of the elections one applies the principle of relative majority. The same procedure is used to determine the results when delegates to the conference or congress are selected.

18. If during the election none of the candidates receives more than half of the votes of the voting members, then a follow-up election will be held between the two candidates who received the greatest number of votes. If that round of voting does not yield a positive result, then nominations are once again taken, the candidates are discussed, and a vote is taken using the procedures outlined in this instruction. At this time, candidates from previous balloting rounds may be nominated and discussed.

19. When the party committee (commission) is formed through direct delegation by lower organizations, the conference or congress makes a decision to recognize the authority of the delegated members of the party committees and audit (inspection) commissions by open voting. The verification of their credentials may be assigned to the mandate commission of the conference or congress or to a special commission formed by the party committee from delegates to the conference or congress.

20. All the materials from the secret vote are stored in the party committees (organizations) until the next elections, after which they are destroyed and a document certifying this is drawn up.

Recall and Withdrawal of a Member of an Executive or Audit Organ

21. During the period between reports and elections a decision to recall or replace members of elective organs who have been elected or delegated according to the quota principle is made by the delegating party organization with two-thirds of the votes of the participants in its meeting or plenum of the executive organ. In this case the credentials of the new candidates are confirmed at plenums of the corresponding party committees or meetings of the audit commissions.

22. Questions of the recall of a member of the party committee of the primary organization from the party committee elected at the party conference and the recall of a member of the raykom, gorkom, district committee, obkom, kraykom, republic party committee of an autonomous republic, or the central committee of the communist party of the Union republic, and members of the corresponding audit commissions, if they have compromised themselves, have lost the confidence of the party organization, or for other objective reasons, are decided at a meeting of the giver party organ by a secret vote. The decision is considered adopted if no less than two-thirds of the members of the executive or audit organ have voted in favor of it.

Members of the party committees and bureaus of the primary party organizations who are elected at meetings are removed from membership in the party committees and bureaus at party meetings through a secret vote.

If a member of the party organ leaves an organization or moves outside the rayon, city, oblast, kray, or republic and asks to be relieved of his duties as a member of the party committee (bureau) or audit commission or in the event that he voluntarily retires, this question is resolved at a meeting or session of the committee (commission) by an open vote. The decision on withdrawal is considered adopted if more than half of those participating in the voting vote in favor of it.

When a new member of the party organ is elected to replace the one who has withdrawn, the same established quota remains in effect for the corresponding party organizations.

Interparty Forum Pledges 'Civic Consensus'

PM0211152990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 Oct 90 Second Edition p 4

[A. Stakhov article: "In Society's Interests"]

[Text] An interparty consultative meeting was held 27 October in which representatives of 16 political parties, social unions, and movements took part. These included the Constitutional Democratic Party (People's Freedom Party), the Party of Man, the Fatherland Revival League, the "Man-Nature" Revival League, the Liberal Democratic Party, the People's Constitutional Party, the Marxist Platform in the CPSU, the Young People's Creative Association, the Islamic Revival Party, and others. They concluded an interparty political agreement aimed at promoting the peaceful resolution of topical economic, social, political, and legal problems.

The participants in the agreement pledge, in particular, to do everything in their power to achieve national and civic consensus in the country, to prevent terror, genocide, and repression in society, and to resolve on a just and equitable basis all national, interethnic, and ethnic problems without the use of force or discrimination. They will endeavor to jointly elaborate measures to put a stop to interethnic strife and discord.

These planned joint steps include promoting the economic, cultural, social, and moral revival of the country, the development of ethnic, interethnic, and interrepublic cooperation and the comprehensive progress of the peoples, the prevention of environmental disasters, and so forth. It was decided to set up an interparty consultative council, working groups, and commissions to develop a consensus and, through talks, reach general positions as regards getting the country out of the crisis. It was also decided to ask the USSR Supreme Soviet to set up structures (commissions) to ensure constant communications with representatives of all parties and movements in order to integrate their proposals to stabilize the situation in the country.

Well, these are noble intentions. They remain to be backed up by concrete action.

Commentary Supports Gorbachev's Foreign Visits

PM0511160190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 Nov 90 First Edition p 3

[Observer Manki Ponomarev article under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Views": "Europe, and Not Only Europe"]

[Text] During these days, when the newspapers have been full of photographs and reports on the USSR president's meetings with the leaders first of Spain and then of France, questions have occurred to many people both inside and outside our country: "Was it necessary for Gorbachev to travel to Madrid and Paris? Are there not enough things to do at home, rather than traveling around Europe?" These questions have not only been raised in private conversations but have even surfaced in the pages of certain press organs.

Well, it is possible to understand those who raised such questions. Our country really is in a difficult position. Centrifugal trends are increasing more and more, interethnic feuds are continuing, economic indicators are going downhill, and inflation is pressing harder and harder. And under these conditions it is necessary to utilize all means leading to the stabilization of the situation and to support for Soviet perestroika. Including in the international arena.

The undoubted successes of Soviet foreign policy and the assertion of the new political thinking in world affairs are not hindering but, on the contrary, promoting the surmounting of our perestroika's difficulties. The period of acute East-West confrontation is vanishing into the past, as well as, incidentally, the actual division of the world along these lines. Our security is strengthening—which makes it possible to carry out the large-scale maneuvering of the forces and funds which until recently were expended on military ends above all.

The integration of the Soviet economy in the world economy is no less significant. The broadening of international cooperation is a necessary condition for stabilizing the situation which has been exacerbated in the extreme on our domestic market and for resolving urgent national economic tasks.

But both the further strengthening of security and the broadening of world economic ties are possible only if our partners abroad are sure that we are unswervingly following the course of perestroika, that we will preserve the unity of our multinational state, and that our leadership really controls the situation in the country. Of course, all this was subjected to a very detailed discussion during the visits to Spain and France.

Commenting on the talks between M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand and on the situation in the Soviet Union which formed the background to them, a Paris newspaper wrote this: "It is necessary not to help but to save perestroika." That might be putting it too strongly, although those words reflect the opinion of an influential section of the public in a number of European countries. The agreements signed during the visits will undoubtedly do much to promote perestroika, like the \$1.5 billion received on credit from Spain and the \$1 billion from France. These funds will be aimed at meeting our most acute needs at the difficult stage of the start of the transition to the market.

This was why it was worth making foreign visits even at such a critical time for us. On one indispensable condition, it is true. Their results—political support and economic assistance—must not disappear into the sand, as it were. Unfortunately, we encounter this all too frequently. And this depends not on which country the president has visited but on each one of us, on a responsible attitude toward the matter, which must not and cannot be replaced by any political speculations.

Changes are occurring not only in the Soviet Union. They are changing the face of Europe and of the whole world. The meeting of the leaders of the 34 CSCE participant states, which opens in Paris 19 November, must be a visible landmark on the path of these changes. Now, during the few days remaining until that date, complex and multifaceted work is being done to complete its preparation and to check not only the rough sketches but also the first working drawings of the future common European home.

This work is proceeding in many directions. And M.S. Gorbachev's meetings with the leaders of Spain and France occupied a worthy place in it. Major packages of various agreements in the political, economic, scientific, technical, and cultural spheres were signed during the visits. Standing out among them, above all, are the Soviet-Spanish Joint Political Declaration and the Treaty of Concord and Cooperation between the USSR and France.

The new Soviet-French treaty emphasizes that the sides intend to pool their efforts in surmounting the split in

the European continent and transforming it into a peaceful and cohesive Europe endowed with permanent security and cooperation mechanisms, and it notes the role which the CSCE process must play in this respect.

The common desire to ensure the major success of the Paris meeting can be seen quite clearly. At the session of the communities' European Council, which has just been held in Rome, the Common Market member countries outlined a major program of further economic and political integration of West European states, thereby laying one more stone in the foundations of the common European home. Balkan countries will also lay their own foundation stone. A second meeting of these countries' foreign ministers has just been held in the Albanian capital, and the document which they adopted emphasized the historic significance of the CSCE for a secure and peaceful future and prosperity.

To judge from press reports, the multilateral talks in Vienna on the reduction of conventional arms in Europe, the agreement on which is to be signed by the leaders of the 34 states in Paris, are almost over. There were more than enough difficulties on the way to formulating this agreement, which is called upon to a considerable degree to rid Europe of the mountains of weapons accumulated during the "cold war" years. The Warsaw Pact countries, for example, were unable to agree among themselves on ceilings for the remaining arms until the last moment. But now this problem too has been resolved, and an agreement on this question is expected to be signed by the Warsaw Pact foreign ministers in Budapest tomorrow.

It is worth working for the lofty goals which the participants in the all-European process set themselves. The common European home is no longer a remote dream, something for the future, but something that is being created today. And all these meetings, visits, conferences, and talks are adding more and more new brushstrokes to the overall picture portraying this home.

Of course, it must not be thought that its erection is merely a technical matter. No, there are still very, very many problems, difficulties, and dangers. There are still politicians around—ones who hold responsible posts, moreover—who continue to think in old terms. They include FRG Defense Minister G. Stoltenberg. In Munich he has just declared the need to create a "European defensive organization," justifying this by saying that even after the withdrawal of its troops from East Europe the USSR will remain the strongest military power on the continent, and so there is a need for "military protection against the hardly predictable political upheavals and changes in the East."

The future European home must be completely safe for the lives of the peoples inhabiting it. But is it really possible to be sure that it is safe when a military conflagration could flare up on the threshold at any moment? Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and, in general, the entire situation in the Persian Gulf zone and the

Near East threatens to cause such a conflagration. It was no coincidence that the crisis in the Persian Gulf region occupied such a prominent place in the Soviet leader's talks with the leaders of Spain and France. The immutable Soviet policy aimed at stopping aggression and ensuring UN unity in the face of it was reaffirmed. At the same time it was clearly shown that the Soviet Union advocates resolving the problem by political means. This position met with the understanding and support of the partners in the talks.

The UN Security Council has just adopted another resolution aimed at ending Iraq's aggression. This is already the 10th resolution and, probably, the sternest of all. It emphasizes that, if Iraq refuses to observe its provisions, as well as the provisions of the previous Council decisions, the Council will be forced to take further measures envisaged by the UN Charter. At present just two such measures are being considered—the blocking of all ties with Iraq and the mounting of military operations.

S. Husayn's regime has received enough clear signals during these days, particularly from Paris. They must be heeded. Peace and security must prevail not only in Europe. A conflagration lit somewhere outside Europe could embrace both it and the whole world. The stern warning about this is further evidence of the acute need for the visit which the Soviet president has just made to Spain and France.

'Action Program-90' Authors Interviewed

91UN0159A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 2 Oct 90 p 3

[Interview with V.I. Skurlatov, member of the Russian Democratic Front (RDF) council of representatives, board member of the Russian People's Front, and instructor of the All-Union Institute for Raising Qualifications of Press Workers; and V.I. Kondaurov, member of the RDF council of representatives, board member of the Russian People's Front, Sociology Department head at the Moscow State Institute of Culture, candidate of philosophy, and CPSU member; by correspondent I. Losev in Moscow on 22 September: "Toward a Civil Peace Through Spontaneous Revolt"]

[Text] On 14 September 1990 LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA published the "Action Program-90" of the Russian Democratic Front [RDF]. To put it mildly, the readers' reactions to this document were not simple; the editorial board was peppered with questions such as how could the newspaper publish the program of an organization that in words is for a civil peace, but in effect calls for the overthrow of the political structure existing in the country, for the provocation of civil war.

With the understanding that paper is paper and what is written on it does not always accurately convey the thoughts and hopes of the authors, that imprecise word usage can render a text ambiguous, and that everybody comprehends things in his own way, not the way that it

really is, our correspondent met with one of the "Program's" authors in Moscow, a member of the RDF council of representatives, board member of the Russian People's Front, instructor of the All-Union Institute for Raising Qualifications of Press Workers V.I. Skurlatov. Participating in the conversation was member of the RDF council of representatives, board member of the Russian People's Front, Sociology Department head at the Moscow State Institute of Culture, candidate of philosophy, CPSU member V.I. Kondaurov.

[Losev] The "Program" asserts that "many new political associations calling themselves democratic are from the start infected with the virus of neo-Bolshevik or nationalistic intolerance inherent in the lumpen-ized milieu." Which movements did you have in mind?

[Skurlatov] All political formations without exception.

[Losev] Meaning that you too are ailing with neo-bolshevism?

[Skurlatov] Of course. Humans are not angels. Hence the universal striving for leader-ism, inordinate ambitions. The democratic movements are infected with the same illnesses that infect society. In a poverty-ridden country, there always exists an inclination to create myths, to worship the usual idol. We fear that in the event of the rapid development of events, the onset of new mass demonstrations, the demagogues, the new demons will creep forth again, leading the masses behind them on the way to dictatorship in the interests of a narrow group of individuals or some sort of mafia organizations. In other words, we are afraid of a coup. Global practice has developed one single method for counteracting such a danger—the privatization of property. Common sense, rather than belief in myths, distinguishes economically independent people. They can stand up for themselves and be able to do the same for democracy and civilization.

[Losev] And what will serve as a guarantee that the privatization of the economy will not lead to the manifestation of a new elite comprising all the people infected with this same neo-bolshevik, lumpen-proletarian ideology?

[Skurlatov] This is of principle importance. The "500 days program" adopted for implementation in Russia is based upon privatization through sale and recovery. The realization of this program on this basis will lead to exactly what you are talking about. Such concern is completely justified.

In our view, the principle of the uncompensated transfer of the means of production to the hands of the labor collectives could become a guarantee against new mafia organizations. This would allow mafioso aspirations to become localized. Moreover, if a member of some labor collective proved to be a member of some mafia organization, he would serve the collective, and not the other way around.

Shareholding of this property in accordance with each person's contribution to its development must become the subsequent step of such privatization. During the first phase, this stock offering, like the transfer of property, must be free, uncompensated. And the final thing, not simply privatization as power's pittance, but self-privatization is needed, that is, a general movement for acquisition of economic sovereignty by every enterprise. And this is achievable only under political sovereignty. We favor a broad system of production parliamentarianism, the structure of public self-management, whose first act should be a declaration of economic sovereignty of the enterprise.

[Losev] The "Program" states that "the only antidote against an actual threat of civil war and the establishment of new dictatorships is our own...initiatives for the creation of a sufficiently mass stratum of patriotic property owners," that is, what V.I. Kondaurov just spoke of. Does "our" mean those belonging to the RDF, the Russian People's Front, or does the word "our" take on a broader meaning?

[Kondaurov] Our—this is a popular, common democratic idea. True, there is nothing new in these ideas. The entire world history of the development of democracy is based upon these ideas. This same process of privatization through holding stock in property is being successfully developed in many countries. We are the only state that does not understand this, that does not wish to take the clear-cut path. We compose all sorts of projects trying to find "our own path." And, as a rule, this self-sufficiency is leading us down a dead-end. Everyone wants to attain power, everyone considers himself a prophet, a God...

[Skurlatov] And this really troubles us. Such a phenomenon can be observed everywhere in the democratic movement. It is very dangerous, since it can lead to a regime of a personal dictatorship.

[Kondaurov] Just look, after all, not a single one of the most important decisions made, whether by the Union Supreme Soviet or the Russian Supreme Soviet, or the old power structure, has been put up for referendum. That same "500 days program" adopted for implementation by Russia is undergoing wide criticism on the part of the consecrated ones, but it is still unknown by the Russian people. Again, everything has been decided for us.

[Losev] The first point of the "Action-90 Program" speaks of the organization of mass actions, seizure of buildings belonging to party organs, and converting them into sociopolitical centers in which "the democratic deputies and activists will receive the population." What will this actually give the population, other than the expropriation of CPSU property and even great exacerbation of the situation?

[Kondaurov] I am principally opposed to that terminology used in the "Program," "seizure," and the such-like. I think that the privatization "operation" must

concern everyone, including economic and political structures. After all, not only the CPSU, but the Komsomol and the Council of Ministers have illegally owned the people's property... There must occur either an act of uncompensated return of the people's property, or confiscation by court order, in accordance with the law.

[Losev] But certainly many raykom and gorkom buildings have been built with party resources, the money of communists?

[Skurlatov] We are getting too general. Let us move on to a practical plane. Let us take, for example, Lyubertsy, where I live. After all, it is impossible to get the CPSU raykom building through the courts. Let us be realistic; no one will give it up. That is why I am for seizing the building with both hands. During a revolutionary period the seizure of property, buildings is to be exercised without prior permission... This is inevitable. Preferably without bloodshed, of course. But when the indignation of the masses reaches its limits, the authorities must yield. And not just the authorities. All these old structures must be cleared out in good time. If they get a little busted up in the process, we do not care, either. We have to be realists; unfortunately, this is at the basis of human nature. We have the right to, they stole our lives! We can take what they stole from us!

[Losev] Once again, the expropriation of the expropriators?

[Skurlatov] Yes! But without demagoguery this time!

[Losev] But then where is the absence of demagoguery? In your words on the necessity of expropriation and the permissibility of bloodshed, a revolt with axes? Or in the "Action Program," which theoretically is based upon the need to preserve civil peace at any price within the framework of a rule-of-law state?

[Skurlatov] Many figures of the democratic movement are inclined to theorize, and I am attempting to view our tasks from a practical angle. We cannot get by without the decisive actions of seizure without prior permission; Revolution is not just a struggle of intellectuals, but of the will.

[Losev] Who then, whose will shall lead the popular masses to the struggle?

[Skurlatov] A critical mass of popular indignation may arise even without the precise realization of the program's aspects, without the participation of guides.

[Losev] Valeriy Ivanovich, even Herzen wrote of the terrible force of a spontaneous Russian revolt. Certainly revolution is distinguished from a revolt by its singleness of purpose, its organization. What you are talking about is a revolt, spontaneity. With axes, clubs, and a sea of blood... It is entirely possible that the "rebels" will be divided in half and set to raid both the party committees and democratic councils simultaneously. What then?

[Skurlatov] Of course it would be preferable not to permit that. But after all, we will not be at fault if such flare-ups arise spontaneously.

[Losev] Yet if you created the organization, armed it with a program for actions, then obviously you must bear the responsibility for the implementation of that program, for the consequences to which it may lead.

[Skurlatov] Yes, where our organizations exist, in the case that a spontaneous revolt arises, we will try to lead and organize it.

[Losev] How broad is the network of your organizations, and how large is their membership?

[Skurlatov] We do not have a fixed membership in the RDF, so I cannot name an exact figure.

[Losev] Fine, let us go on. How do you propose to "counteract violence on the part of local reaction," with the help of squatter brigades? Will this not lead to provocation of armed clashes, to that same civil war that you are against in the "Program"?

[Kondaurov] I do not share the principle of violence and I cannot say anything on the subject. "Action Program-90 was compiled before I came to the RDF, and frankly speaking, I simply do not know what it entails.

[Skurlatov] There will be no armed encounters with squatters. People will occupy land without prior permission and call it their own. The militia will not shoot at 50 armed people. It is important to create a precedent and receive society's support.

[Losev] But will such a seizure be lawful? All the more so because the American squatters took the Indians' land, and defended it with arms. Does this mean bloodshed?

[Skurlatov] It will be on the conscience of the authorities. If people want to work their land, let them work their land. And who is going to shoot at squatters, some kolkhoz workers? Authority can shoot but it must yield!

[Losev] Meaning that you are building this point of the program on your conviction that the authorities will not shoot?

[Skurlatov] Yes, authority must yield to the resolution of the people, otherwise we will sweep it away.

[Losev] Point 15 of the program describes the politicization of students and youth in training and the simultaneous depoliticization of education. How can these be combined?

[Kondaurov] I can explain this contradiction thus: the politicization of youth must lead to their active participation in the country's political life, and the depoliticization of education must free them from the monopoly of communist ideology. In my opinion, there is an imprecise use of a term here. In general, the democratic movement is now experiencing a demand for intellect, for theoreticians. To a certain extent, I share Lenin's

words to the effect that there is no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory. And unfortunately, until now, we do not have revolutionary theory.

I think that it is not just a matter of the lack of theory. There is still one other condition interfering with the process of democratization, and today's conversation simply confirmed its presence. Alas, too many of those who call themselves and consider themselves democrats have a very hazy idea of democracy as such. Phrases on seizures, insubordination, rebuffs and the like flash through the program. But after all, these are words from quite a different "opera." And the very fact that there are among the "new democrats" those prepared to "bust up" all unsuitables, that is, people such as V.I. Kondaurov, to whom the shortcomings of the democratic movement are clear, gives us hope for overcoming the "age diseases." In the meantime, it must be stated that there is scarcely a whiff of democracy in the Russian democratic forum.

The meeting with V.I. Skurlatov and V.I. Kondaurov took place on the eve of the opening of the 4th RFD Congress, which, as was reported in our paper, took place in Moscow on 23 September 1990. Notes on the congress will be published.

Reaction to Action Program-90 Publication

91UN0110A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 18 Oct 90 p 2

[Unattributed article: "More About What Has Been Printed: What the Pen Has Written..."]

[Text] On 3 October RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA reprinted from the magazine DIALOG the sensation-causing "Action Program-90" of the Russian Democratic Forum in abridged form, along with the magazine's editorial comments. This is ordinary, routine practice in the newspaper business.

But on that same day an official document from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet was delivered by courier to the newspaper's editorial office. It follows from the document that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee on the Mass Media, Ties With Social Organizations and Citizen Mass Movements, and the Study of Public Opinion had created a special "investigation commission" to look into articles in the central press concerning this "Action Program-90." Yu. Luchinskiy, chairman of the commission, had signed this letter and demanded that RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA answer certain questions.

On 6 October we responded as best we could to these questions. And we proposed that the investigation be conducted in an atmosphere of glasnost and openness, so that our readers might become participants in this interesting parliamentary experiment. Although it seemed to us that certain questions posed in Yu. Luchinskiy's letter to RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA were, putting it mildly, contradictory to appropriate articles of the Law on the Press. Then too, is the Union press accountable to

republic commissions? But what is this between citizens of a single Motherland, especially citizens striving to achieve civil accord in society? And as a former procuracy official, Yuriy Mikhaylovich would surely check his questions with the law...

It seems he checked them. When the newspaper came out, the chairman of the "investigation commission" sent a reply to the editorial office. But not so much a reply really, as a personal letter to the editor in chief in which he wittily demonstrated his penchant for elegant writing. With regard to the questions posed to him publicly by the newspaper, the people's deputy did not reply so wittily. This also happens.

Apparently assessing his own creative work soberly and fairly, Yuriy Mikhaylovich proposed unequivocally at the end of his letter (we quote):

"But, if you have no objection, let us not clutter up the newspapers with this subject and create needless correspondence before the commission's work is done."

No, let us not.

But then how are we to understand the grievance of the deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee against RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, relayed 16 October through the radio program "Mayak," that the newspaper did not publish his letter? As a method used in conducting investigations? Or as an appeal for civil accord? Or as open defamation? And how then does such a statement correlate with deputy ethics?

Newspapers Develop in Oblasts

LD0411153690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1400 GMT 4 Nov 90

["Press News"]

[Summary] The status of the former oblast party newspaper VOSTOCHNOSIBIRSKAYA PRAVDA has changed. Henceforth it is to be a sociopolitical newspaper serving Irkutsk Oblast.

A trial edition of a newspaper RUSSKIY SEVER [Russian North] has been published by the Vologda Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies. Yeltsin has welcomed the new publication. "In a message he calls it an important step in the cause of establishing genuine democracy."

The Kaluga Oblast Executive Committee's internal affairs directorate has begun publication of the KRIMINALNYY VESTNIK [Crime News]. It is targeted at a broad readership.

MOLVA Fashion Newspaper Published in Moscow

LD0411001890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Interview with Ya.N. Zasurskiy, dean of the journalism faculty at Moscow State University, by unidentified

correspondent; from the "Vremya" newscast feature captioned "Newspapers and Journals 1990"—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] I have in my hands, as it happens, two first editions of MOLVA at once—the same MOLVA which was published nearly 160 years ago, and in which Pushkin and Gogol were published, and also the new MOLVA, the MOLVA which is published by Moscow University. A question to the founder of this newspaper: The old MOLVA attracted such people as, for example, Herzen, Ogarev, and Goncharov, but who will work with your newspaper?

[Zasurskiy] Well, the future Herzens, Ogarevs, Goncharevs, our youngsters. I think that fine journalists will come of them. We want to publish a commercial newspaper. There will be various fashions. At that time, in 1831, the fashions were like these, in Paris.

[Correspondent] On the subject of Paris: Will your newspaper report on Parisian fashions?

[Zasurskiy] Yes, we will. We already have our correspondents, our former students in Paris; they will send us the latest Parisian fashions. Perhaps not such beautiful, exotic ones—but interesting ones, nevertheless.

[Correspondent] So this newspaper, in the old days, was called the newspaper of fashions and news. The fashions are clear, but what about the news?

[Zasurskiy] What has happened in the course of the week, what has happened in Moscow over the week.

[Correspondent] In the old days the newspaper was designed to be read as you went along, in a carriage, in a cafe, or in a tavern. Where will people be able to read your newspaper?

[Zasurskiy] In the metro, in the street cars, if it's not too crowded. In the political sphere we have achieved a great deal. Our journalism is free of command and administrative pressure. Commerce is on the way. How can we avoid pressure, not only command and administrative, but also commercial? I think that we shall try to find such paths as to create a model of truly free journalism.

Rules Governing Telephone Tapping Outlined

PM0511170590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 4 Nov 90 p 1

[Unattributed report under the "Dialogue: Ask Questions" rubric in response to reader's letter: "You Mean You're Being Bugged?"; first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Text] I heard that telephone tapping has now been authorized. Is that true? If so, please tell me who can tap the Kremlin telephones?

[Signed] A. Oleksenko, Dnepropetrovsk.

In June the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted the USSR Law on Amendments and Additions to the Fundamentals of Criminal Procedure in the USSR and the Union Republics. But it seemed to pass unnoticed at the time... But the law is extremely interesting.

Various articles were added to the Fundamentals of USSR Criminal Procedure. One gives internal affairs organs the right to tap telephone conversations. Another permits the use of audio and video recordings during an investigation as material evidence.

Yes, internal affairs organs can now tap telephones. However, according to the law, they can only do this in respect of criminal proceedings and only with authorization from the prosecutor or on the basis of a court ruling. MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] personnel believe that this provides firm guarantees against total telephone surveillance.

So in order to tap Kremlin telephones, in theory you only need authorization from a prosecutor. Not even the general prosecutor. Any prosecutor!..

Admittedly, I was told at the USSR MVD that this is by no means that simple. Kremlin telephones are reliably protected by cunning electronics. Decoding apparatus is needed, and the militia does not have it. And anyhow, the implementation of this law will certainly be extremely problematic. There is neither the technology nor the skilled specialists.

Incidentally, the Austrian, U.S., British, and German police have the right to tap telephone conversations. Lawyers regard the new law as being totally in line with the Guiding Principles in the Sphere of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice recommended by the UN General Assembly in 1985.

Defense Plant Starts Producing Satellite Dishes

PM0511091190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 Oct 90 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed report accompanying photograph of technicians installing satellite dish]

[Text] Novosibirsk—The satellite television receiving dish which the Novosibirsk Electronics Plant has started producing will help widen the range of reception in any part of the country not only of broadcasts from the Soviet Union, but also of foreign television channels.

This opportunity has arisen as a result of conversion. The plant decided to switch to consumer goods production in order not to miss out on the profits that can be made today.

Collaboration with the Moscow Electrical Equipment Plant helped to rapidly organize the assembly of dishes in Moscow and Novosibirsk.

Seminar on International Cooperatives Held

LD0411210890 Moscow TASS in English 2046 GMT
4 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 4 TASS—An international practical seminar on the activities of cooperatives in the Soviet Union and in the West was held here between November 1-3. It was organized by the Moscow Higher Party School and the Friedrich Ebert Foundation from Germany.

Addressing the seminar, Yu. Vorontsov, vice-president of the Soviet Alliance of United Cooperatives, said that "the peak of persecutions against cooperatives in this country, that fell on March and April of the current year, is over". He believes that as a result of the pressure, organized by party and economic structures, cooperatives lost 500,000 jobs out of five million. This is a perceptible loss during the transition to a market-oriented system.

He said that there are 250,000 cooperatives in the Soviet Union. However, attempts continue to be made to put them under strict control of the state and to regulate their activities with the help of numerous instructions and rules. Vorontsov supported the granting of economic independence and freedom to cooperatives.

Professor B. Flieger from the Centre for Problems of Cooperatives and Ecology from Cologne, Germany, told the seminar about the structure and principles of the organization of economic activities of cooperatives in his country. He stressed that in Germany cooperatives were formed to meet the demands of the population in food, housing, services and so on. As a rule, these are solid and successful enterprises.

Roundtable Opens in Moscow on Jewish Traditions

PM0211165190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Lev Aleynik and Marina Lebedeva report: "Popular Traditions Revived"]

[Text] Moscow—An all-Union "roundtable" meeting which opened in Moscow 28 October is devoted to the revival of Jewish education and traditions in our country. It has been organized by the KHAMA international Jewish cultural enlightenment organization.

Even today people can remember how innumerable emaciated martyrs for the faith returned from the camps in the early fifties. We children were told that they had been sentenced for hooliganism. During that period a small group of enthusiasts in the country launched the idea of reviving and preserving national Jewish traditions. Charitable societies and educational establishments—yeshivas and heders—operated deep underground in apartments under the cover of people meeting to have a party. They gathered to study the Pentateuch and the writings of philosophers. That was when KHAMA was set up. Many of those who studied, taught

then, and survived are now major figures in various countries' Jewish communities. Crowds of pilgrims from around the world gather every Sunday in New York at the residence of Rabbi M. Shneyerson [name as transliterated], the spiritual head of world Jewry, to hear him preach, solve personal and social problems, and to obtain his blessing...

Opening the meeting, Rabbi Yeshua Raskin [name as transliterated] (Israel), KHAMA president in the USSR, welcomed the envoys from many countries and 100 cities in the union republics. The first speech was made by RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputy Lev Ponomarev, leader of the recently established "Democratic Russia" people's movement, who congratulated the participants and guests on behalf of his colleagues in the Russian legislature. Milton Gralla [surname as transliterated] (United States), the well-known philanthropist and honored guest of the forum, the famous cantor Berl Zeltsman [name as transliterated], and the leaders of foreign publishing houses, mass media organs, and the USSR All-Union Confederation of Jewish Organizations and Communities stressed the indissoluble links between the world's communities and the fate of their fellow-believers—our countrymen—and all those who have only recently, during this period, been able to openly study their people's language, culture, and faith and teach it to their children so that, as the Bible says, the "silver chain should not be broken..."

Economic

State Bank Official on Ruble Exchange Rate

LD0511194690 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT
5 Nov 90

[By TASS special correspondent Georgiy Meyzerov]

[Text] Moscow November 5 TASS—The introduction of a commercial exchange rate for the ruble is a logical event in the reform of the Soviet Union's foreign economic activity, Oleg Mozhayskov, member of the board of the USSR State Bank, told a press conference here today.

He said the aim of the move was to "completely exclude requests by Soviet partners in foreign economic ties for budget allocations."

Mozhayskov said the problem of the ruble's "real exchange rate to the dollar has never been as acute under the centralized economy as it is now."

"Several years ago, the absolute exchange rate of the ruble did not matter much to partners in foreign economic ties, as the state knew in advance what it would sell and buy.

"All profits from foreign trade operations were included in the budget, and unprofitable operations were subsidised from it.

"The decentralisation of foreign economic activities has complicated relations between Soviet enterprises participating in foreign economic operations and the state. The introduction of the new exchange rate will make the problem much less acute."

Mozhayskov explained that the new commercial exchange rate of the ruble—1.8 rubles for U.S. dollar—"reflects the average parity between the purchasing power of the ruble and the dollar. This parity has been established on the basis of the correlation between Soviet and world prices on a wider range of goods than previously used."

He noted that the former exchange rate—60 kopecks per dollar—was "unreal as it reflected prices on a very narrow group of goods."

Mozhayskov said the new rate "corresponds to the Soviet economy's export possibilities. However, the introduction of the commercial exchange rate does not annul the existing rate used in foreign trade payments.

"The existence of parallel exchange rates is in line with international practices, for instance, in countries with nonconvertible currency, where each exchange rate fulfills its own functions.

"The ruble's commercial exchange rate should prevent Soviet enterprises and organisations from asking the Finance Ministry for subsidies. Subsidies should not exist, except for those for imports of social significance, such as medicines."

Speaking about payments for goods and services by Soviet holders of hard currency, Mozhayskov said that prices of these goods and services "are being brought into line with the new rate" and that their hard currency prices "remain unchanged."

AUCCTU Audit Commission Report Presented

914F0024A Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Oct 90 p 2

[Report by L.A. Kubyak, chairman of the Central Audit Commission: "Report of the Central Trade Union Audit Commission to the 19th Congress of USSR Trade Unions"]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies to the congress!

In keeping with the bylaws of the USSR trade unions and the provisions concerning the Central Audit Commission approved by the 18th Congress of USSR Trade Unions, we are reporting to the congress on the financial and economic activity of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Trade Union Council] and the organizations and institutions under its jurisdiction, on the implementation of the trade union budget and the state social security budget, and on the work to consider suggestions, statements, and complaints from the workers.

During the three report years the trade union budget income as a whole amounted to 13.7 billion rubles [R],

and expenditures—R13.8 billion. Membership dues comprised 69.3 percent of this income. R6.7 billion were left at the disposal of the trade union organizations, which comprises 70.3 percent of the overall sum of the membership dues collected.

Because of the increased financial rights of the local trade union organizations, the sum of membership dues remaining at their disposal increased significantly, and in the first half of 1990 amounted to 76.3 percent.

On the whole, the expenditure of funds from the trade union budget was distributed in the following areas: for mass cultural work—R5.8 billion; for physical culture and sports—R3.2 billion; for material and legal aid—R1.2 billion; and for the administrative and business expenditures of all trade union organizations—R2 billion.

Unfortunately, the democratization of financial work in the trade unions and the expansion of the rights of the trade union organs in expending the funds from the trade union budget were not accompanied by the proper restructuring and organizational activity for rational and more effective utilization of funds.

As a result, there was a reduction of the financial activity of the trade union clubs, stadiums, child-youth sports schools, and other interunion facilities. Trade union expenditures on construction, repair, and acquisition of fixed capital decreased. At the same time, there was a considerable increase in expenditures on tourist outings, material assistance, and the maintenance of paid workers in the trade union organs.

It should be noted that while general trade union property is valued at a total of R11 billion, funds are necessary for its proper maintenance.

The Central Audit Commission considers it necessary to notify congress delegates that in recent years in local areas and in the center there has been a tendency to transfer fixed capital that is joint trade union property—houses of culture, sanatoriums, houses of recreation, and buildings for trade union courses—to various organizations without reimbursement, while at the same time they have not come up with a basic answer to the question of who has the right to dispose of this property. During the past three years alone, more than R300 million worth of fixed capital has been transferred in this manner. The question of trade union property is a very serious one and the congress delegates should express their opinions regarding it.

Deductions from membership dues to the AUCCTU during the three report years amounted to R735.5 million. And while these deductions comprised 8.9 percent during 1987-1988, during 1989 they amounted to 5.7 percent. As for the first half of 1990, deductions from trade union dues to the AUCCTU and the trade union central committee amounted to only 3.5 percent instead of the six percent envisioned by the budget. Additionally, profit from publishing activity became part of the

AUCCTU income and there were also other revenues. During the report period AUCCTU incomes amounted to R1.1 billion.

Where were these funds spent? Above all, they were used for Unionwide measures for programs that were adopted but did not envision them.

R457 million were allotted for the development of various social and cultural facilities in regions of the Far North, Siberia, the Far East, and rural regions of the non-Chernozem zone of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the children's fund imeni V.I. Lenin, the culture fund, the fund for boarding houses for veterans of war and labor, and for rendering material assistance to victims of the earthquakes in the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and other regions.

R378 million went for the construction of sanatoriums, tourist bases, and other trade union facilities; R228 million—for financing central trade union committees; R158 million—for maintaining organizations under the jurisdiction of the AUCCTU, including subsidies for the VDFSO [expansion unidentified]—R93 million. The AUCCTU annually allotted up to R8 million for financial aid to students in vocational and technical schools and VUZ's [higher educational institutions] for acquiring cultural and sports supplies and equipment; R1.2 million were allotted for paying stipends from trade unions to students of VUZ's and technical secondary schools [tekhnikums], as well as to students in vocational and technical schools.

On the whole, expenditures amounted to R1.3 billion. The difference between the expenditures and the incomes were covered with residual budget funds.

At the same time, the Central Audit Commission thinks that there was not always a critical need to spend funds from the trade union budget. For example, for prizes for winning the all-Union DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy]—R127,000; for financing the all-Union voluntary society for fighting for sobriety—R8.6 million; and for financing the activity of enterprises under the jurisdiction of the AUCCTU that should actually be earning their own money—such as the Exhibition-Methods Center of the AUCCTU at the VDNKh SSSR [Exhibition of the Achievements of the USSR National Economy], the Center for Public Opinion Study, and others—on whose maintenance they spent R4 million during the report period. The Central Scientific Research Institute of Labor Protection in Moscow spent the R1 million it allotted for capital repair of its building inefficiently, in our opinion.

R208,000 were transferred to the board of the Union of Writers for doing creative reports of writers' organizations for the workers. Tens of thousands of rubles were spent on conducting various kinds of reviews and competitions with the payment of bonuses when the activities were no longer timely.

It should be noted that the majority of decisions to allot funds for various purposes were made by the AUCCTU Secretariat in keeping with working procedure, which violated the principle of collegiality in the discussion of the expediency of expending funds. There was no proper supervision of the expenditure of funds.

Comrades! As you know, the trade unions control the state social security budget. The implementation of this budget over the three years is characterized by the following figures: income—R179.4 billion; expenditures—R174.6 billion.

The amount by which income exceeded expenditures created the possibility of using the free residual of budget funds to conduct a number of large-scale social measures and render financial aid to trade union councils and committees.

While the social security budget was implemented well, there were cases in which the trade union councils and committees approached this issue without the proper degree of responsibility, did not exhibit the necessary demandingness in dealing with insured parties, and did not impose economic sanctions on the leaders of enterprises that allowed violations.

The fact that certain trade union organizations underestimated the importance of well placed supervision and left it entirely up to the public audit commissions, in which, as a rule, there were no specialists, led to a situation where at a number of enterprises and in certain organizations and institutions there were practically no inspections of insured parties.

It should be admitted that in the work of protecting and strengthening the health of the workers and their children, the money available in the local areas from the funds for improving preventive work and health measures was used poorly and sometimes ineffectively as well.

In social security work a large amount of responsibility is placed on the trade unions for providing the workers with passes to sanatorium and health resort facilities. But it was precisely in this work that there were many shortcomings, and the most serious one was the increase in the number of passes that were not used. During the report period their number more than doubled and amounted to 56,000. Especially alarming are cases of failure to use social security passes to sanatoriums and pensions with treatment when there is a critical shortage of them. While in 1987, 2,000 passes ended up like this, in 1989 their number had increased to more than 12,000. There is something for members of the audit commissions of trade union organizations to think about here. The unfairness of the distribution of passes to prestigious health facilities evoked an especially large number of complaints. Here is what was revealed, for example, by an inspection of social fairness in the distribution of passes to the Karlovy Vary health resort, which is run by the AUCCTU. In all the trade union councils that were inspected there was a so-called reserve ranging from

three to 30 percent. These reserve passes were issued, as a rule, to management workers and primarily to members of their families. Many of the committees made no information public—such as how many passes were given out and to whom they were issued. While the number of available passes was negligible, there were numerous cases where the same individuals were issued passes repeatedly.

The workers had many complaints about health resort service as well. While noting that these complaints were fair and that there are serious shortcomings in the work of certain health facilities, we should like to draw your attention to some problems. In spite of the fact that the trade unions annually invest large amounts of money in expanding and reinforcing the material and technical base and R750 million were assimilated during the report period, the number of beds in health resorts is decreasing. An inspection and an analysis of the condition of the fixed capital of trade union health facilities show that 30 percent of the beds are not provided with sanitary and living amenities. Many health facilities are located in unadapted premises and from 2,000 to 4,000 beds are written off each year. And all this leads to a reduction of the number of passes. The desire of the AUCCTU at any price to retain the number of passes that are distributed, apparently in the interests of the workers, has led to a situation where at the present time health facilities are shut down for capital repair once every 18 years. It is quite natural that there is not a large demand among the workers for passes to health facilities with no amenities. Here it is appropriate to note that of the overall number of health facilities and pensions in existence in the country, only about 50 percent belong to the trade unions, and under these conditions it is quite impossible to understand why the trade union health facilities are being transferred to the departments free of charge.

A serious problem that requires an immediate solution is that of the prices in effect for passes, which are established by a 1956 USSR Council of Ministers decree. Prices in the country have changed repeatedly during the past 34 years and hence there has also been an increase in expenditures for the operation of health facilities, and the AUCCTU makes up for these expenditures from the social security budget. Because of the introduction of new prices and rates, as well as payment for labor resources and because of the appearance of contractual prices, these subsidies are increasing to R500 a year. This is why we should support the suggestion of the Central Council for Administration of Trade Union Health Resorts and the AUCCTU that subsidies are needed not for the health facilities but for the workers and the underprivileged segments of the population so that under the conditions of market relations they will have the opportunity to acquire passes for therapy and recreation.

During the report period the Central Audit Commission conducted an audit of the financial and economic

activity of the Central Council for Tourism and Excursions of the AUCCTU. The system of the Central Council has R2 billion worth of fixed capital that is invested in its own hotels, tourism bases, means of transportation, camp grounds, and so forth. While noting the large volume of work for organizing the recreation of Soviet tourists and excursion members, and there are more than 200 million of them each year, it should be noted that the level of this work is still far from what is desired.

The audit established that there were serious shortcomings both in the activity of the Central Council itself and in the organizations under its jurisdiction.

The changeover to the new conditions of management in the system of the Central Council for Tourism and Excursions was conducted without the proper preparation and it did not produce the necessary results in the improvement of the service for tourists. The material and technical base is in need of reconstruction and there was illegal sales of passes to the best tourist complexes during the summer period through cooperatives at increased prices. The lack of proper supervision created conditions for increasing the production costs and other planning indicators in the organizations under its jurisdiction, which led to an unjustified increase in profit and excessive payment of remuneration to the apparatus of the administrations of the Central Council.

It was established that there were serious shortcomings in the acquisition and utilization of computer equipment, computers, and computer software. The unbusinesslike relations that have developed in the organizations under the jurisdiction of the Central Council with certain cooperatives have led to the withdrawal of non-cash assets and their transfer to cash during the buying and selling of the aforementioned equipment. Neither the tourist bases nor the tourists in the local areas have gained anything from this kind of activity.

All this shows that the organizations under the jurisdiction of the Central Council did not have the proper accounting for material values or control over the expenditure of material and monetary funds.

The activity of the Central Council for Tourism and Excursions was criticized sharply at the meeting of the Central Audit Commission. The leaders of the council (chairman—V.G. Pugiyev) have taken measures to eliminate the shortcomings and the guilty parties have been punished, but there is still a large amount of work to do to impose order.

For many years the Central Audit Commission has made serious critical remarks against the AUCCTU concerning problems of organizing capital construction. Unfortunately, today it is still necessary to state that the same shortcomings continue to exist. The failure to assimilate capital investments that have been allotted has become a chronic problem. During the past three years, the AUCCTU GlavUKS [Main Administration for Capital Construction] has failed to provide for the

introduction of 11,500 beds in sanatorium-health resort and tourist institutions. Moreover there is a tendency toward an increase in this number and, as a result, an increase in incomplete construction, which amounted to more than R700 million at the end of 1989.

One cannot say that the AUCCTU has not taken measures to improve its construction activity. The person in charge of the GlavUKS was AUCCTU Secretary I.Ye. Klyuchkov. An independent cost accounting association, Soyuzkurortstroy, was organized. Measures were taken to increase the capacities of their own construction organizations. In three years, R100 million was allotted from the trade union budget for these purposes. But it should be stated that the repeated structural changes did not cause the work to improve. A number of construction organizations and enterprises still have low profitability and they are slow in changing over to cost accounting and progressive forms of labor organization. While the production base has a small capacity, the dispersion of material, labor, and financial resources continues. It should also be noted that the construction organizations of the trade unions have not eliminated padding, especially in capital repair.

The audit of the Moskurortstroy trust (manager—Vikhorev) that was just completed revealed blatant mismanagement; the trust conducted capital repair of outside organizations to the detriment of the construction of planned trade union facilities; there were thousands of rubles' worth of padding and exaggerated work volumes; and more than R270,000 were spent on illegal payment of wages. They did not provide for maintaining the construction equipment and materials. While there was a critical shortage of construction materials, there were cases where they were sold to so-called "necessary people." This trust has now been transferred to the Central Council for Tourism and Excursions, and V.G. Pugiyev will have to draw serious conclusions about his work.

The activity of the Profizdat publishing and printing association was subjected to deep and comprehensive analysis during the report period. During this time the AUCCTU Secretariat resolved a number of principal issues pertaining to the planning and economic work of the publishing house, including determining the profit of the publishing house so that the changeover to cost accounting and self-financing will not be to the detriment of the interests of the trade union organizations, which are among the main clients of the products of Profizdat. It should be noted that in the editorial offices of the publishing house and the trade union journals measures have been taken to introduce the proper order into their work. But the activity of Profizdat would be more effective if the AUCCTU were to adopt efficient and effective measures for completing the construction of the new building for the printing plant. This construction project has already been dragged out for more than 15 years.

It should be noted that over four years the AUCCTU has used R20 million of the profit from the newspaper TRUD for to develop party printing plants in which the newspaper was printed. This money could have been used to create its own printing complex. And the collective of the Profizdat printing plant is still working under the most difficult conditions, which should be cause for closing it down.

Workers of the editorial offices and the publishing house for the newspaper TRUD, which has annually produced more than R40 million in profit for the trade union budget, are not working under the best conditions either. With each inspection the Central Audit Commission has drawn the attention of the secretary of the AUCCTU, V.M. Mishin, who is in charge of this organ, to the need to improve the social and living conditions of the newspaper workers, but no effective measures have been taken during the report period. Beginning in 1990, by a decision of the AUCCTU Secretariat, the rights of the newspaper editorial staffs to use the honorarium fund have been expanded somewhat and the deductions from profit into the incentive fund have increased.

During the report period the Central Audit Commission devoted a great deal of attention to the financial and economic activity of the AUCCTU itself and the enterprises under the jurisdiction of the Administration of Affairs.

During the three years R42 million were allotted for the administrative-economic and organizational activity of the AUCCTU, including R22.4 million to maintain the apparatus. As of the beginning of 1990 the apparatus included 664 people. Taking into account the fact that 40 percent of the wage fund was turned over to the federation of independent trade unions of Russia, the AUCCTU apparatus should have been reduced.

At the 18th Trade Union Congress critical remarks were made against the trade union leaders because of the complicated, cumbersome structure of the AUCCTU Administration of Affairs.

Throughout the report period, the Central Audit Commission returned to this question repeatedly, but nobody paid any attention to our remarks. The managers of the Administration of Affairs were V.G. Lomonosov and I.Ye. Klochkov, AUCCTU deputy chairmen, and V.M. Mishin, AUCCTU secretary. The managers of the Administration of Affairs changed but things did not improve.

At the present time there are essentially two organs operating in parallel dealing with the enterprises under their jurisdiction—the Administration of Affairs and its Economic Administration—which leads to duplication of functions, irresponsibility, and unjustified growth of the apparatus.

The audit of the economic activity of the Administration of Affairs and the enterprises under its jurisdiction

revealed cases of mismanagement and sometimes expenditure of funds from the trade union budget for the wrong purposes, as well as maintenance of superfluous staff. The head bookkeepers of many enterprises are not qualified for their positions and their role has been reduced. This has led to a situation where there has been theft, extravagance, improper writing off of material values, and padding.

A year and a half ago the Central Audit Commission considered the materials on foreign economic activity and services rendered to foreign firms by enterprises of the AUCCTU Administration of Affairs.

These materials were carefully considered recently at a meeting of the AUCCTU Secretariat. During the course of the discussion they revealed facts that require additional verification. A decision was made to continue the verification and to consider the results after the congress.

The Central Audit Commission thinks that the AUCCTU Secretariat did not provide proper leadership of its own business, and this business was immense. The AUCCTU has under its direct jurisdiction six scientific research institutes, two publishing houses, two higher schools, and two central councils—one for management of health resources and the other for tourism and excursions—as well as the GlavUKS, Soyuzkurortstroy, the scientific center, the House of Unions, and the Economic Administration with its numerous enterprises. This is a list of the facilities inspected by the Central Audit Commission elected by the 18th Congress of USSR Trade Unions.

The majority of the issues pertaining to economic activity were resolved under the so-called working procedure, without joint discussion, or by one of the secretaries—the one in charge. Many of the notes of the Central Audit Commission concerning violations that were discovered were not considered. This tells not only of a low level of executive discipline, but also of the loss of a sense of responsibility. During the report period the AUCCTU Secretariat never once heard a report from the Administration of Affairs on economic activity, although about R20 million were spent on financing the enterprises under its jurisdiction during this period. Here it should be noted that 50 percent of the AUCCTU leadership had changed by the time of the present congress.

The financial work in the AUCCTU is not on the proper level. The reorganization of auditing and bookkeeping services that was conducted in the apparatus did practically nothing to strengthen financial control over the economic activity of the enterprises and organizations under its jurisdiction.

The role of the AUCCTU head bookkeeper diminished—he became the deputy chief of the Finance Department. This area of work requires immediate reinforcement and the creation of conditions whereby the

head bookkeeper when performing his immediate functions is first controller in the expenditure of trade union money.

The adoption of decisions by the AUCCTU Secretariat to create joint enterprises and reorganize existing ones was done without the necessary economic calculations or the proper justification. Thus, the reorganizations of the chief administration for machine and technical supplies [Glavmashtekhsnab] (chief—A.N. Borisov) conducted repeatedly over a short period of time led to increasing the number of levels of administration of enterprises and growth of the number of people employed in the apparatus and their wage fund. All this was reflected in the increased expenditures of trade union organs on material and technical service and a reduction of the transfer of profits to the AUCCTU.

In our opinion, when resolving problems of creating production enterprises, one should first of all decide the purposes for which they are being created: to obtain profit or to create additional jobs or to produce consumer goods at prices the workers can afford.

The work of the apparatus with letters and statements from the workers was under the constant supervision of the Central Audit Commission. During the report period, the AUCCTU received 362,000 letters and verbal appeals, including 34,000 collective ones. Attention is drawn to the persistent tendency toward an increase in the number of appeals to the central organs regarding issues that could only be resolved locally. Less than 10 percent of the appeals from the workers had a positive outcome. Special concern is caused by the fact that in their letters the workers are more and more frequently expressing concern about their future. Many letters criticize the work of the trade union organs. While agreeing with the fact that the first job of the trade union is protection of the rights of the working man, the workers are demanding that the trade unions be more resolute in influencing the processes taking place in the country and that there be more openness in the work of the trade union center at the level of government organs. With good reason, they want to know how the trade union center is defending their interests.

As before, there are still many appeals related to violations of the law when workers are fired on the initiative of the administration. People are especially terrified by arbitrariness on the threshold of entering into market relations, which threaten them with unemployment.

Many statements and verbal appeals have come in to the AUCCTU from individuals who have been fired because they have not passed certification and also officials whose names have been on the notorious lists No. 1 and No. 2.

As a rule, these are the most complicated complaints to consider. It is necessary to report that the AUCCTU has repeatedly raised the question of abolishing these lists and certifications since here more than anywhere else group egoism and settling of personal accounts are given

the force of law. These issues have not yet been resolved legislatively and people continue to suffer, but the AUCCTU cannot help them either since it actually has no right to do so.

The results of the inspection of departments of the AUCCTU for work with letters show that the practice of considering letters and appeals from the workers in the apparatus has improved somewhat. But this does not mean that there are no complaints against departments of the AUCCTU and organizations under their jurisdiction. There have been imprecise responses and references to legal norms that are no longer in effect. In certain cases not enough attention has been devoted to evaluating the proposals of the authors and references were made to materials from inspections of local organs even though what the authors were complaining about was the lack of objectivity of the local inspections, the prejudice, and the distortion of facts.

The letters from the workers also contain many complaints about the style of work of the department for legal work of the AUCCTU. Frequently, instead of a concrete answer, the authors were sent letters of a general explanatory and standard nature. There was more than one case in which, when considering one complaint or another, workers of the department did not delve into the essence of the conflict, referred to inspections of various organs and organizations, and practically refused to help the applicants, merely creating the illusion of protecting the rights of the workers and in reality dooming the citizens to uselessly running around from one department to another. There were cases in which the leaders of a department (the former department chief V.V. Kleptsov), despite the opinion of specialists in the area of law, stubbornly defended their own viewpoint and in essence saved the honor of their own uniform, which disturbed the authors and generated a flow of repeat appeals, which comprised almost 30 percent of the letters that came to the department during the report period. The AUCCTU Secretariat devoted attention to cases of formalism and red tape in the work with complaints in this department. But inspections show that these negative phenomena continue to exist.

And in conclusion: Because of the democratization and expansion of the rights of trade union organizations and the use of their own funds, the role of audit commissions for monitoring their expenditures should increase. It should be noted that, as in the last report period, far from all audit commissions kept up with their functions. This was brought about, above all, by the fact the people selected for the audit commissions were not trained for this work. This was probably one of the reasons why during the report period there were increased numbers of cases of pilferage and theft of trade union funds, which in 1989 in the system as a whole amounted to R1.7 million, and as of 1 January 1990 had increased to R5 million.

The Central Audit Commission considers it necessary to report to the congress that it experienced certain difficulties in performing the functions assigned to it by the 18th Congress of USSR Trade Unions. Far from all the leaders of the organizations that were audited understood the role of the Central Audit Commission in checking on the expediency of the expenditure and preservation of trade union funds. Some people tried to hold back documents; this happened especially when we conducted audits of enterprises under the jurisdiction of the AUCCTU Administration of Affairs. The apparatus of economic services frequently held up the inspections; but still, in spite of everything, the Central Audit Commission just in the past four months caused more than R1 million to be deposited in the AUCCTU coffers.

The Audit Commission could have achieved better results in its work if it had broader rights. In this connection, when revising the provisions on the Audit Commission, which you will be discussing, it should be granted the right not only to ask the Trade Union Center to report results to it, but also to make decisions about bringing guilty parties to account for the material damages they have caused to the trade union and, if necessary, to turn the materials over to investigative organs.

All this will contribute to increasing the role of the Central Audit Commission, improving the financial and economic activity of the Trade Union Center and the organizations under its jurisdiction, expending funds efficiently, and preserving material assets.

Decree's Impact on Savings, Interest Viewed

914A0052A Moscow *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA*
in Russian 28 Oct 90 p 3

[Interview with Vyacheslav Ivanovich Solovov, first deputy chairman of the board of the USSR Savings Bank, by A. Nadzharov; place and date not given: "Is the Money Becoming Worth Less?"]

[Text]The rates of interest on money deposited for a certain period of time by the population are changing as of 1 November by Presidential Decree. For example, on money deposited for one to three years, the investor will now receive five percent annually; from three to five years—seven percent; more than five years—nine percent annually.

We asked V. Solovov, first deputy chairman of the board of the USSR Savings Bank, to comment on the new rules on savings.

[Nadzharov] Vyacheslav Ivanovich, it was necessary to raise the interest rates on deposits, of course. But why was it done by such a small percentage? Will this really exceed the depreciation of the ruble?

[Solovov] Today it will cover depreciation for the most part. According to calculations by specialists of the USSR Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics], the annual increase in prices is four percent, and with regard

to so-called hidden inflation, it is nine percent. So there is sense in doing a reassessment. Especially because at present it is difficult to "supply goods" against our deposits.

[Nadzharov] All that is true, but to look ahead three, five, or even more than 10 years in the face of our present uncertainty...

[Solovov] Who says that the interest rates will remain unchanged? They will be changed with regard to the economic situation. Incidentally, in other countries this happens very often.

[Nadzharov] So far as I know, both the state and the commercial banks operate completely independently.

[Solovov] Exactly. I do not believe that any Western bank would invest the assets of its investors into some long-term shaky transaction connected with changing the course of rivers or with the stalled construction of facilities no one needs. And banks, incidentally, are supplied with their own revenues much more than our savings banks. Only consider that we are going to reassess the savings of tens of millions of people, and our equipment only recently graduated from the abacus stage.

[Nadzharov] One gets the impression that the sole criterion of Soviet financial policy remains "the opinion of the authorities." How long will that last?

[Solovov] As long as adoption of the USSR Supreme Soviet Law on Banks and Banking Activities drags on. As long as banks are dependent on particular people and organizations, do not expect common sense. I will name only one of the consequences of their caprice. Over the last three to four years due to a budget deficit about 400 million rubles [R] in tender backed up by absolutely nothing entered circulation. In essence, half of the rubles in our country are a purely hypothetical concept. New interest rates must tie up and back up these rubles too.

[Nadzharov] Vyacheslav Ivanovich! These rates probably were not absolutely indisputable. Otherwise they would have been introduced much earlier. What kept this from happening?

[Solovov] A certain amount of time was necessary in order to calculate everything and overcome the inertia of those who would like everything to remain the old way. The people, they said, will put the money into the State Bank even if only out of fear that it will be stolen. But with the present desire to get rid of money as quickly as possible and buy anything at all, this argument is no longer as convincing as it was previously. On the other hand, there was a proposal to increase interest rates to 12, 15, and 18 percent. Why is such an approach dangerous? Interest rates are an additional payment which should be backed up with money. At present it comprises approximately R7.5 million per year. After 1 November the total will increase to about R15 million.

An interest rate of 12 percent, for instance, would require an additional R35-40 million.

[Nadzharov] Where will you get them from? Reduce deductions to the state budget?

[Solovov] No. Because in that event the budget deficit would increase sharply and two-thirds, not half, of the rubles would lose their value.

[Nadzharov] So it seems that the tax on enterprises should be increased.

[Solovov] And where will the labor collectives get money from? They will only increase prices for the goods they produce, which will increase inflation. As a result, one may consider the new interest rates well thought-out and sufficiently moderate.

[Nadzharov] A last question. How should the individual investor conduct himself after the edict goes into effect on 1 November?

[Solovov] First and foremost, he should consider whether he will need the money in his passbook for a year (or more). If not, he should stop into a branch of the State Bank and reregister for a certificate of deposit at the new interest rate. That will be much better than hurrying to make a purchase that is not needed.

[Nadzharov] Does this mean that he absolutely must go to a savings bank on the first day of November?

[Solovov] Of course not. But we request that investors, in their own interest, make up their minds as quickly as possible and stop into a bank. Their savings will earn the new rate as of that day.

Perm Gas Pipeline Section Completed

LD0611021190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
2230 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Excerpt] Laying of the Perm section of a 75 km gas pipeline has been completed two months ahead of schedule. Tyumen fuel will travel through the pipeline to the Urals. The intergasstroy trust collective is conducting work here. German and Soviet specialists are working together on the route. [passage omitted]

Russian Bonds Sold at 10 Percent Discount

LD0611052190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0430 GMT 6 Nov 90

[Text] Sale of the Russian 5 percent internal loan bonds for 1990 is starting at lower than state prices. Each 100 rubles of the Russian debt vouchers, which the bonds essentially are, can be acquired at a price of not more than 90 rubles.

Altay Kray Feed Plant Stands Empty

PM0611092090 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1530 GMT 1 Nov 90

[Report by correspondents L. Salnikov, K. Bratchun from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent] Our camera team had noticed this large building several times before, during our duty tours to the Altay. It is clearly visible from the road, but we never saw anyone near it. It looked deserted, there was no movement, you got the impression that it was an abandoned project. As it turned out, it is an abandoned plant.

How long has it not been working?

[G.L. Bogachev, chief engineer of the nonoperational plant, identified by caption] From the beginning, that is to say since the closure, for the past 19 months.

[Correspondent] What sort of a plant is it? What is it supposed to produce?

[Bogachev] It is a plant for the production of meat and bone meal.

[Correspondent] That is to say, an excellent feed for livestock raising?

[Bogachev] Yes, protein.

[Correspondent] What is the problem in your opinion? Why has this plant been nonoperational for so long?

[Bogachev] Well, basically, it is probably not needed in the kray, in this area.

[Correspondent] So why was it built? Why were more than 2 million rubles spent on it? The answer, and the responsibility, are lost somewhere in the much criticized past, in the period of stagnation. As is the rule in questions of property belonging to the people, it is difficult to identify the culprit. There are reasons for the suspension of operations at the plant, of course. Inspectors have declared the boiler-house unsafe. The plant was built on an unsuitable, marshy site. Cracks are showing on the walls. And so forth.

Several months have passed since this interview was taken. But little has changed. Except that the plant now looks even more dilapidated. The plant's future looks very uncertain, both seen from the new building of the kray agro-industrial union—despite the fact that it was conceived with a view to improving the situation in livestock raising—and from the offices of the Mamontovskiy Rayon Soviet Executive Committee, on whose territory the enterprise is located.

So what next? Although this does not fall within my sphere of competence, I will risk to suggest a way out of this clearly abnormal situation. Altay has recently been declared a free-enterprise zone. Maybe the powers that be should offer the abandoned plant to enterprising

people—either ours or foreigners—for the establishment of a joint venture here. Otherwise it may turn into yet another monument to mismanagement.

Agricultural

Meeting Views 'Unsatisfactory' Grain Delivery

LD0511210290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1900 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Text] The progress of fulfilling state orders for grain deliveries into the all-Union fund from the 1990 harvest was analyzed today at a session of the operational group of the USSR Council of Ministers, chaired by Voronin, with the participation of leaders of major grain-producing oblasts, krais, and autonomous republics of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and the Kazakh SSR.

It was noted that against the state order for the volume of 85 million tonnes, by the beginning of November collective and state farms and other agricultural enterprises had sold only 66 million tonnes.

Around the RSFSR, the state order has been only 70 percent fulfilled; in the Ukrainian SSR, 85 percent; and in the Kazakh SSR, 86 percent.

The unsatisfactory fulfillment of obligations for sales of grain to the state by many farms, rayons, oblasts, krais, and republics is linked to a sharp fall in state procurement discipline, and also to insufficiently effective adoption of measures to give material incentives to labor collectives at collective and state farms.

Material and technical resources such as tractors, trucks, autos, and construction and other materials allocated by a decision of the USSR Government for reciprocal sales of grain by collective and state farms have to date not been dispatched in full volume.

Accord was reached at the session that leaders of oblasts and krais and republics will take additional measures to sell marketable grain that is in the possession of collective and state farms to the state. Such is the position first and foremost in Krasnodar Kray, in the Bashkir Autonomous SSR; Voronezh, Kurgan, Dnepropetrovsk, Kherson, Cherkassy, Kokchetav, Kustanay, Tselinograd, and certain other oblasts. The State Committee for Material and Technical Supply and the Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine-Building have been given instructions to ensure immediate deliveries without delay of material and technical resources to farms that are selling above-contract grain to the state.

It has been deemed essential to prepare special USSR Government decisions to stimulate production and increase in grain purchases in 1991.

Official Cited on Winter Food Supplies

PM0611103990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Interview with L. Vashchukov, USSR State Committee for Statistics administration chief, by I. Totkiy: "Put in a Word About Our Daily Bread"]

[Text] "Each morning, as I take the newspaper out of the mailbox, I cannot help feeling irritated: Whichever paper you take, everywhere there is political fuss, incomprehensible disputes, far-fetched moral homilies. Do the editorial offices believe they will take the place of bread, milk, meat, and sugar for us? Alas, no. But what do the people's deputies have to say after swearing at the elections that they would be concerned for their voters' needs? Forgetting the empty shelves in the food stores, they have become caught up in a cycle of lawmaking. They only mention quite rarely what we are going to eat in the winter.

"Perhaps you can tell us in the newspaper how much grain, potatoes, and vegetables have been harvested and what has been laid in for the winter? Or do you too believe that we PRAVDA readers are not interested?"

A serious rebuke leveled against the newspaper by O. Vasilyev from Kaluga, and one that is also encountered in other letters. The editorial office asked L. Vashchukov, USSR Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] administration chief, to describe how work is being completed on the fields and how much food has been laid in for the winter.

"We have grown accustomed to pinning the most flattering epithets on grain," L. Vashchukov says. "It is the source of everything, more precious than gold, the country's main resource. It is a pity that a frightening emptiness sometimes yawns behind these epithets. The amount of land sown to grain is inexorably being reduced. In 1978, when the best harvest for the time was brought in, grain fields covered 128.5 million hectares. Now they have been reduced by 17.5 million hectares. Nonetheless, they have provided a generous harvest. The gross grain harvest will be approximately 240 million tonnes. More could have been harvested. Were it not for the losses.... In some places they 'carried off' one-fifth of the harvest or even one-fourth. So you can calculate how much grain failed to reach the granaries...."

[Totkiy] And how much has been sold to the state?

[Vashchukov] Some 65.8 million tonnes. The state order has been fulfilled 76 percent. The arable farmers of Georgia, Stavropol, and Rostov, Orel, Uralsk, and several other oblasts have coped with it. The farms of Moldova [Moldavia], Kirghizia, Kazakhstan, and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] are still in arrears. It is surprising that a number of rayons are obviously reluctant to supplement the country's grain stocks. For instance, God has been generous, as they say, with the harvest for the arable farmers of Dnepropetrovsk Oblast. The harvest is slightly more

than 10 quintals [per hectare] more than in 1978. Yet the state has been sold scarcely half as much. The same "disease" has struck the farms of Tataria and Crimean, Kherson, Vinnitsa, Omsk, and Novosibirsk Oblasts....

[Totskiy] So with a good grain harvest we may be without grain?

[Vashchukov] Every year approximately 36 million tonnes of grain are spent on baking bread and bread articles, and nearly 66 million tonnes have been procured. As we can see, the residual is not large, and it is not sufficient for the needs of stockraising. Yet grain purchases have obviously started to reach a standstill. The farms do not want to sell it. What is the reason? One of the main reasons in my view lies in the correlation of prices for grain bought from the farms and for mixed feed sold by the state. And the second reason is that it is no accident that the kolkhozes and sovkhoses [collective and state farms] are withholding grain. They are releasing it to feed the livestock and are thus trying to improve the local population's provision with stock-raising produces. And try to condemn them for that....

[Totskiy] Leonid Ivanovich, this year the potato plantations were a natural disaster area. Have we succeeded in lifting the potatoes everywhere?

[Vashchukov] Among the population, which allocates 3.5 million hectares to potatoes, there are scarcely any unharvested sectors left. But on the kolkhoz and sovkhos plantations (they covered 2,256,000 hectares) the harvest is still continuing. Potatoes have been lifted from 2 million hectares. The harvest is lower than last year—on average 104 quintals per hectare. Many people blame the weather. But surely that is not the only reason? You remember when city dwellers held out a helping hand to the countryside? And when the students were invited to the fields? Tremendously belatedly. Hence the large losses of potatoes and their poor quality.

Not all is well with potato procurements. As of 22 October about 8 million tonnes of potatoes had been purchased—half what was envisaged by contracts. In the past few days potato deliveries to Moscow and Leningrad have improved somewhat, but you cannot call them even satisfactory. Moscow should receive 659,000 tonnes of potatoes, yet only 204,000 tonnes have been unloaded. Only 62,500 tonnes of the planned 225,000 tonnes have reached Leningrad.

Some 13.6 million tonnes of vegetable produce has been procured. But the harvest is still not completed. The farms are counting on obtaining approximately 27 million tonnes of vegetables—somewhat less than last year. But that is not the main reason why the population of many cities is left without the vitamin-rich produce. A considerable proportion of this produce is perishing on the fields because of the poor organization of transportation and reception. In addition in some places it is forbidden to ship vegetables outside the republics and oblasts. A strange and incomprehensible phenomenon. It

is probably no accident that market prices for potatoes and fruit and vegetables have immediately soared.

[Totskiy] Readers complain they cannot trade in their sugar coupons. What is happening with sugar?

[Vashchukov] I think that here the weather has put matters right. As of 29 October sugar beet had been harvested from 2.8 million hectares. Some 64.7 million tonnes has reached the procurement centers. Its processing is in full swing. The only distressing thing is that the equipment of many plants is obviously obsolete, there are no reliable storehouses, and there is a shortage of transport. This is leading to enormous losses of sugar. Last season about 1 million tonnes failed to reach the consumers. It is easy to calculate how many coupons remained unexchanged. It is time the ministries and departments connected with the country's sugar sector took urgent measures to eliminate these colossal losses.

Sugar Supply, Delivery Problems Discussed

LD0211181990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1600 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Summary] An exchange of views today between the Ministry of Railways, the railways, and the country's sugar processing factories was concerned with the country's sugar supply. It was noted with alarm that in the last two months, despite a good harvest and large stores, Ukrainian factories have sharply cut deliveries to other parts of the country. Lvov Oblast Executive Committee has stopped sugar exports from the oblast. Factories in Ivano-Frankovsk, Volynskaya, Ternopol, and Rovno Oblasts have cut deliveries by almost 40 percent compared with recent years. As a result, Novosibirsk, Amur, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and the Transcaucasus are without sugar. The Ukrainian Council of Ministers has unofficially told the USSR Ministry of Trade that it will deliver in the fourth quarter 500,000 tonnes of sugar less than last year. As a result Kazakhstan is not delivering grain to the Ukraine and Orenburg Oblast is not sending durum wheat for pasta factories. Russia is considering halting deliveries of buckwheat to Ukrainian processing factories. Sugar factories process 90,000 tonnes daily, but the shops remain empty.

Scientific

Soviet, Japanese Cosmonauts Prepare 2 Dec Flight

LD0611101790 Moscow TASS in English 1006 GMT
6 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow November 6 TASS—Soviet-Japanese space crews begin their final comprehensive training today, going through all operations that they will perform in space during an international space expedition to begin on December 2.

Two Soviet-Japanese space crews were introduced at the mission control center on November 2. The first crew consists of Soviet cosmonauts Viktor Afanasyev and Musa Manarov and Japanese television journalist Trehiko Akiyama. The other team includes Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Sergey Krikalev and Japanese woman journalist Rioko Kikuchi.

"Our Japanese colleague is expected to broadcast a ten-minute television report from the orbital complex Mir every day throughout the eight-day flight. There will be also a 20-minute radio broadcast daily. Both Japanese broadcast journalists have gained wide experience during training on the ground," Afanasyev told TASS.

"This work is very laborious. Therefore the flight engineer of the crew will help the Japanese journalist in space.

"It is also planned to perform a medico-biological experiment to study the effects of zero gravity on cosmonaut's sleep patterns during the adaptation period," Afanasyev said.

"An experiment with frogs, suggested by the Japanese side, is also noteworthy. The experiment will involve an utterly special frog population found in Japan. They differ from the other frogs by having natural suction disks that will enable them in principle to fix their position on board the orbital station. It is very interesting to find out how the frogs will behave in weightless conditions," Afanasyev added.

One representative of the TBS television and broadcasting network will work in space. Which crew will go to space will be decided upon by a state commission on the eve of the launch.

Work Continues Aboard Mir Space Station

LD0611112690 Moscow TASS in English 1111 GMT
6 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 6 TASS—Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov continue explorations and experiments aboard the Soviet Mir space station.

Work on space materials science occupies a prominent place in the flight programme. To produce two more semiconductor monocrystals that will be used in Soviet microelectronics, the crew began smelting on the Gallar and Krater-V units on November 4-5.

The cosmonauts continue the Soviet-Bulgarian experiment in the Svet greenhouse to study the development of higher plants in space. They monitor microclimate at the greenhouse, regularly photograph the plants and report the results to earth.

Today's work began with a medical check-up, including the state of the cosmonauts' cardiovascular systems. The timetable also provides for astrophysical observations, technical experiments and physical exercises on the ergometric bike and the moving platform.

According to radio talks with the crew and the medical check-up, their health is good.

Military

General Batenin on Pact Disbandment

AU0511124990 Hamburg DIE WELT in German
5 Nov 90 p 12

[Report by Peter Philipps on interview with General Geliy Batenin, military expert of the CPSU Central Committee and military policy adviser to President Gorbachev: "Soviets Announce Disbandment of Pact Staff and Supreme Command"]

[Text] Bonn—The Soviet Union is preparing the disbandment of the Warsaw Pact joint supreme command and staff in Moscow. "The day is probably not far off" when both organizations will be disbanded, General Geliy Batenin, military expert of the CPSU Central Committee and military policy adviser of President Gorbachev, announced in an interview for DIE WELT. As a military organization "with firm subordination," the Warsaw Pact has actually terminated its existence.

How far the other Pact states have broken with the past was demonstrated during their meeting in Budapest on the weekend [3-4 November]. Only four of the six countries dispatched their foreign ministers; CSFR Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier excused himself due to illness, his Soviet counterpart Eduard Shevardnadze said that "other commitments" were the reason for his absence.

At the next Pact summit in November, new structures and mechanisms for coordination will be submitted to the members, Batenin told DIE WELT: "They are to do justice to the new contents of relations between the allied countries, as well as to the historic development in Europe. Constructive cooperation with NATO might be a very important practical military function of such bodies."

The new role of the Warsaw Pact will have to be seen mainly as a "political organization for stabilizing the extraordinary processes in all seven East European countries." Within the framework of the Warsaw Pact reorganized in this way, these countries could "participate more effectively in cooperation in the field of European security and disarmament," Batenin said. Here the Pact might "ensure a smoother integration of the East European countries into the integrated structures of today's West European and future pan-European security."

Referring to the Soviet Union's position in the Gulf conflict, Batenin told DIE WELT that "political support of certain U.S. actions must not be equated with military support. In any case, the USSR will only support military preventive actions against Iraq after the world community's approval in the United Nations." However, even this would not mean that the Soviet Armed Forces will "fully" participate in "combat actions." The Soviets lack

the opportunities for this, while, after all, the United States "concentrated its expeditionary force of more than 200,000 men in the course of several months and had prepared the infrastructure for years."

The United States already has general information on Soviet weapons in Iraq, he said. It will get detailed information "when military actions against Iraq are carried out under the auspices of the United Nations." Batenin reaffirmed the Soviet assessment that the separate settlement of the Gulf conflict is impossible without the involvement of other crisis areas in the Middle East. "Saddam Husayn's demagoguery was acceptable for a certain part of the Arab world."

Referring to the consequences of the Gulf conflict, Batenin said: "The development in the Persian Gulf will undoubtedly also cause other countries with a highly developed military technology to revise their arms trade policies."

Military Parade Participants at Kremlin Meeting

PM0511141990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 4 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Unnamed own correspondent report: "Meeting of Parade Participants"]

[Text] By tradition, the participants in the 120th military parade in Red Square assembled at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses 3 November. A ceremony devoted to the 73d anniversary of Great October was held there. A report was delivered by parade commander Colonel General N. Kalinin. The parade participants were welcomed by representatives of the capital's public.

The meeting was attended by Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Army General V. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister; Army General V. Arkhipov, USSR deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services; and other military leaders.

Also taking part in the meeting's work were Yu. Prokofyev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of Moscow CPSU City Committee, O. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and representatives of soviet, party, and public organizations.

Drafts on Military-Political Organs Examined

PM0511140990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent report: "Draft Examined"]

[Text] An enlarged session of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate has been held with the agenda: "On the Draft Provision on Military-Political Organs in the USSR Armed Forces, KGB Troops, MVD

[Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Forces, and Railroad Troops." Representatives from the KGB troops, MVD internal forces, and railroad troops were invited to the session.

A report on the results of the discussion of the draft throughout the Armed Forces was delivered by Colonel General G. Stefanovskiy, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

All aspects of the concept of reforming military-political structures were verified yet again during the discussion on the report. The results of the discussion were summed up by Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

Akhromeyev Rebuts Arbatov's 'Lies'

PM0211163990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Nov 90 Union Edition p 3

[Letter "To IZVESTIYA" from USSR People's Deputy Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev: "Why Tell Lies?"; last three paragraphs are editorial conclusion.]

[Text] IZVESTIYA No. 297 this year published an article by Academician G.A. Arbatov entitled "Thank You, Mr. Cheney, for Revealing Our Military Secrets to Soviet Parliamentarians" [published in the 1 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 60-61, under the headline 'Arbatov Argues Against Military Secrecy']. This article was written in connection with U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney's speech at a joint sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee and Defense and State Security Committee.

I am a member of the Defense Committee but, for reasons beyond my control, I could not be present when Mr. Cheney delivered this speech at the committee's sitting.

Despite the fact that I was not present at this joint sitting, Academician Arbatov did not forget to mention my name when commenting on the U.S. defense secretary's speech in the aforementioned article, which contains more than enough fact-juggling and falsehood (this is a matter which requires a separate answer). One should not be surprised at this. Our political views are directly opposed on many fundamental questions relating to the development of Soviet society. Polemics are inevitable in view of the fact that we are both active in the press, upholding our views. I have no complaints about this. A fight is a fight.

Something else is at issue—the methods Academician Arbatov resorts to in waging this fight. He claims in the said article that in 1989 I officially and overtly gave the enemy, to use his expression (specifying that he has difficulty saying this when referring to the United States), information constituting a military secret. At the same time, I allegedly concealed this information from the Soviet public and from the USSR Supreme Soviet.

I must clarify this. In the summer of 1989 at the invitation of the U.S. Congress and with the permission of the USSR Supreme Soviet leadership I delivered a report at hearings in the U.S. House of Representatives Armed Services Committee regarding the prospects for the development of the USSR Armed Forces in the nineties in the context of the development of the U.S. Army and Navy over the same period. I did, of course, cite a considerable number of nonsecret figures which had largely been published before in our press, along with some that had not.

Following my return from the United States, I asked our newspapers to publish the report I had delivered at the U.S. Congress. In particular, in response to my appeal I.D. Laptev, former chief editor of IZVESTIYA, said that he could not, unfortunately, do this since the newspaper was preparing an article by the USSR defense minister on a similar topic. This article did, indeed, appear a few days later. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA used the material in part. LITERATURNAYA GAZETA undertook to publish the report in full (with the assistance of USSR People's Deputy F.M. Burlatskiy, whom I asked about this). It did this, admittedly, for reasons unknown to me, not in its main publication but in the supplement to the newspaper, DOSYE. My report was published there virtually in full in September 1989. That was indeed what happened.

Moreover, before going to the United States I provided the Defense and State Security Committee with information about my coming trip. The first thing I did on my return from the United States was to report on my trip to the same committee. I provided the committee leadership and those of its members who asked with the full text of my report. I did, of course, submit a corresponding report to the USSR Supreme Soviet leadership.

Thus, Academician Arbatov has told a lie. First, I did not conceal the substance of my report. I gave it to LITERATURNAYA GAZETA and it published it in the same form as I delivered it in the United States, without changing a single line; second, I reported to the Defense Committee before and after my trip and gave the committee the report which I had delivered in the United States. I do not take seriously the article's suggestion that I divulged a military secret in the United States. I would like to know how long Academician Arbatov will operate by these methods? He uses lies to combat people who disagree with his political views. These lies are widely publicized. It is very difficult, virtually impossible sometimes, to respond to them.

So, I have been accused of dishonesty as a USSR citizen and people's deputy.

I urgently ask IZVESTIYA, since it was this newspaper that published Academician Arbatov's article, to publish this letter of mine in order to defend my honor and dignity.

[Signed] USSR People's Deputy Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev

From the Editorial Office

We reproduce in full the letter which S.F. Akhromeyev sent to IZVESTIYA in response to the publication of G.A. Arbatov's article. It is a pity that Marshal Akhromeyev regarded this article as a personal attack, disregarding its substance. Not in the least do we want to transform the newspaper into a place for "clarifying relations" between two esteemed people's deputies. For clarifying details such as: Did one of them attend a particular sitting, was a particular text submitted for publication in the press, and when precisely—before or after the trip. Or even for arguments about whether specific figures cited in an article are right or wrong.

We believed that Academician Arbatov's article was about something else. About how the military sphere is still outside the jurisdiction of the USSR Supreme Soviet just as it was before in the times of the "unanimous vote" parliament. At any rate it is not subordinate to the extent that is considered normal and absolutely necessary in all democratic states. Our deputies still have less detailed and less reliable information about Soviet defense programs and spending on them than, say, their American counterparts. Our bearers of the supreme legislative power, not to mention the public, still derive such information from American primary sources.

Incidentally, wittingly or unwittingly, S.F. Akhromeyev himself confirms this in his response. U.S. legislators were still the first to hear from him "some figures that had not been published in our press." It was only later that the report he delivered at the U.S. Armed Services Committee was brought to the attention of Soviet deputies and Soviet newspapers.

Mothers Demand Investigation Into Military

PM0511163490 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 44, 30 Oct-5 Nov 90 pp 2-3

[Letter from the "From Our Mailbag" column: "We Mothers of Russian Soldiers"]

[Text] Some of our children, drafted into the Soviet Army, have died in peacetime. No one can bring our children back to life, but other children can be saved.

All our appeals to the higher echelons and all our year-long ordeals have been ignored. The children we have sent to fulfil their civic duty are beaten, maimed, driven to suicide and, as we have recently discovered, are also raped and killed. These crimes are not recorded and the dead are "written off" as suicides. High ranking military men are afraid to investigate for fear of losing their rank and position.

We have been shown the paperwork of the cases that were instituted following the deaths of our children and saw continuous violations of the law.

On June 4, 1990 we mothers went to Red Square where we were immediately surrounded by the members of the police and KGB and were told to leave. We went Red

Square because we were tired after all these years of hardship and had given up all hope of finding the truth. We demand a fair investigation of the circumstances that led to the deaths of our children. We have sent a long list of our children who have died serving in the Soviet Army to the President of the USSR—it is too long to be published in the magazine. We have asked the President to set up special commissions independent from the military and examine all our cases in our presence.

We have taken part in the First All-Union Congress of Parents of Servicemen that pronounced active service in the Soviet Army dangerous to life the life and health of citizens.

We demand a public discussion of draft laws establishing principles and organization of military service, and in the shortest possible time—within two years—the realization of radical military reform and reduction of the period of compulsory military service.

By early 1991 all military construction units should be disbanded and recruitment of non-professionals onto the railway should be banned and the same for the Interior Ministry and the KGB troops.

Alternative service for a period of time not longer than the usual active military service should be brought in as soon as possible. Before the switchover to professional recruitment into the Army, a law needs to be adopted giving the citizens a right to take the stand of a conscientious objector, as well as the right not to obey a criminal order.

An independent commission for examining the Soviet Armed Forces and determining the causes and real culprits of the degradation of the entire system of the country's defence must be created.

We condemn the scale of militarization of Soviet society and the privileged position of the top military leadership and the military-industrial complex.

We deem it our duty to begin the struggle for the demilitarization of the state and individual and the creation of a system of education based on universal human values.

We call upon the public to begin the struggle for making compulsory military service defunct and instituting the military as one of the professions needed by the society.

We demand that the authorities should disband all organizations pursuing militarist goals, first of all the voluntary Society for Assisting Army, Air Force and Navy.

We think it necessary to give the Armed Forces over to public control and allow for any religious influence on servicemen.

[Signed] L. Terekhova, E. Nekrasova, M. Yamansarova, A. Olshanskaya.

Army Rear Services Discuss Transition to Market
PM0511141090 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 3 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Own correspondent P. Altunin report: "Approaching the Market"]

[Text] A conference of USSR Armed Forces Rear Services leading personnel has been held.

In his report Army General V. Arkhipov, USSR deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services, talked about the tasks of providing material and technical support for the Army and Navy during the transition to the market economy. Questions of financial backup, taking account of the new economic realities, were analyzed by Colonel General V. Babyev, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Central Finance Directorate.

The conference was addressed by Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov, USSR defense minister.

Baltic Republics

Lithuania Attempts To Prevent 7 Nov Celebrations

Passes Law on Public Holidays

PM0511152990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Nov 90 Second Edition p 6

[Dispatch by S. Yuryev: "The Different Holidays People Observe"]

[Text] Vilnius—A law on holidays has been adopted in Lithuania. It misses out 7 November, 8 March, and 1 and 9 May. Under the law the day of the rebirth of the Lithuanian state—16 February—has been declared a national holiday. The following holidays have been announced: 1 January—New Year; the Christian Easter (Western tradition); the first Sunday in May—Mother's Day; 6 July—State Day, to mark the occasion of the coronation of King Mindaugas in 1263; 1 November—All Saints' and All Souls' Day; and 25 and 26 December—Christmas. In addition, up to four days' holiday a year—which must subsequently be made up—may be granted to people who profess other religions for their major holidays on application by non-Catholic religious communities registered in the republic.

Pro-CPSU Lithuanians To Celebrate

PM0611100990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 2 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by TASS correspondent: "We Will Express Solidarity: Will There Be an October Celebration in Lithuania?"]

[Text] Vilnius, 1 Nov—Virtually no enterprises, organizations, institutions, or farms in Lithuania will be working today—it is a holiday here. However this holiday is not a celebration, but on the contrary a day of remembrance and sorrow—it is All Saints' Day.

Meanwhile, people in the republic are trying to erase from the memory other dates sacred to the Soviet people. Many Lithuanian citizens now have grave doubts—will the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution be celebrated in the republic? There are grounds for those doubts. The recently adopted Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Law "On Holidays" did not mention 7 November at all. Does that mean that this holiday will be a normal working day in the republic?

"Taking into account the numerous statements from working people coming in to us and to the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee (CPSU)," V. Shved, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Citizens' Committee, told our TASS correspondent, "and guided by the president's decree and the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution, we have adopted a decision on the obligatory commemoration of the 73d anniversary of the Great October Revolution in the republic. On that day there will be rallies, demonstrations, and military parades in Lithuania.

"In my view, this will be an expression of the commitment of sensible Lithuanian citizens to the ideas of October, social justice, and the equality of man."

"A special commission has been formed to prepare and mark this holiday in the Lithuanian capital," V. Khadunkin, secretary of Vilnius Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) City Committee, went on. "On 6 November there will be ceremonial meeting in the city to which veterans of the party, the underground revolutionary movement, the war and labor movement will be invited, along with representatives of labor collectives and public organizations. As usual on this occasion, the anthems of the USSR and the Lithuanian SSR will be played, anthems which are beginning to acquire a special meaning and significance for us. On 7 November there will be a rally of the capital's working people and a military parade by units of the Vilnius Garrison. Flowers will be laid at the V.I. Lenin monument and at the tombs of Lithuanian revolutionaries. I can state quite plainly: There will be a celebration, even though the city authorities are doing everything to oppose it."

Here it should be added that a number of social organizations have adopted a special appeal to Vilnius residents which says among other things: "In 1919 the red banner of Soviet power was raised above the city of Vilnius. Tens of thousands of Vilnius people responded to the call of Lenin's party to fight for the cause of October. Therefore, no force will make us renounce those values. We will express solidarity and demonstrate on that day our commitment to freedom, equality, fraternity, and social justice."

Vilnius Objects to Military Parade

LD0511191690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1700 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Text] Here is an announcement made by Vilnius City Council.

The local government of the City of Vilnius has received a letter from Major General (Uskhopchik), Commander of the Vilnius Garrison, in which he states that a military parade will be held on Lukiskes Square on 7 November.

The administration of the City of Vilnius informs the residents of Vilnius that neither the Vilnius Council nor the administration support the idea of holding a military parade on 7 November because this military action runs counter to the laws of the Republic of Lithuania.

The 7 November is a working day in the Republic of Lithuania. We invite the residents of Vilnius to carry on with their usual duties and not to take part in any illegal measures.

Prunskiene Issues Decree

[Report by Jurate Valanciute]

LD0611110190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1000 GMT 6 Nov 90

[Report by government information representative
Ceslovas Jursenas]

[Text] I wish to acquaint you with two decrees of the Lithuanian Government. The first of them concerns the well known and not very pleasant event, the military parade in Vilnius. The decree is as follows: The Soviet Union's Armed Forces, disregarding the resolution of the Lithuanian Supreme Council of 23 October on the organization of military parades in the Republic of Lithuania, is planning to organize on 7 November of this year a military parade in Vilnius which will be followed by a demonstration on the city streets. In order to avoid possible incidents during the gatherings, the government has instructed the Vilnius city municipality and the Ministry of Internal Affairs to take actions to ensure the safety of the residents. Signed by Premier Kazimiera Prunskiene. The second decree concerns the University of Klaipeda. The republic's government, fulfilling the decision of the Republican Supreme Council on Klaipeda University, has confirmed a provisional council of that university and instructed that provisional council to draw up by 25 November of this year and submit to the Department of Science and Studies a provisional statute of Klaipeda University and, in coordination with the Department of Science and Studies and taking into consideration the conclusions by experts, deal with the problems of the university's structure and organization.

Lithuania Reiterates Demand for Troop Withdrawal

LD0511190290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1700 GMT 5 Nov 90

["Statement from the Supreme Council Presidium and the government of the Republic of Lithuania"]

[Text] Of late the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union, which are illegally stationed in Lithuania, are once again exercising license and impunity, resorting to new acts of coercion. Thus, once again the Soviet Armed Forces manifest themselves as an object of psychological war in the Baltic region.

This is how the brutal kidnapping of citizen Arunas Zibuda on 31 October 1990 in Druskininkai, and the manifestation of military force on November of this year in Vilnius on All Souls Day, must be assessed.

The planned movement of military forces on 7 November of the current year in Vilnius is not in compliance with the decisions about staging military parades which were made by either the local city government or the state government of the Republic of Lithuania. Traffic and the normal working routine of state

offices in the center of Vilnius will be violated and difficulties will be created for those who live there. All this cannot be tolerated.

The kidnapped Arunas Zibuda must be released immediately and the officials who issued such orders, and those who carried them out, must be brought to criminal responsibility.

A private house was broken into and when neighbors appeared, citizen Kolpakiene was injured.

However, there are more blatant aspects to the behavior of the military men. While ignoring the laws of Lithuania and the regulations issued by the government, the military units seek to demonstrate that they are an omnipotent occupation force. They hope to provoke reciprocal action by the citizens.

Another possible objective is to torpedo the planned start of negotiations between the Republic of Lithuania and the Soviet Union. In any case, the question of the subordination and the responsibility of Soviet military men arises which the Supreme Council Presidium and the Government of the Republic of Lithuania address to USSR President M. Gorbachev, USSR Defense Minister Yazov, and General Kuzmin, USSR Baltic Military District commander.

The Supreme Council Presidium and the Government of the Republic of Lithuania state once again: Refusal to serve in the military forces of a foreign country is based on a law of the sovereign state of Lithuania, as well as on personal convictions of the citizen, and is the ultimate right of every citizen of the Republic of Lithuania which equates to the universally recognized human right.

Persistent refusal by the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union to seek a status and a role other than that of an occupation force makes the unanimous declaration by the people of Lithuania during the signature collection campaign in the summer of 1989 more pressing. All Soviet military forces must be withdrawn from the territory of Lithuania without delay. The threat to peace and to the people's lives and health must be eliminated.

Prunskiene Says Relations With USSR Worsening

LD0511210390 Moscow TASS in English 2031 GMT
5 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila]

Vilnius November 5 TASS—Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene has described privatisation as the "corner-stone" of the Lithuanian economic reform.

Addressing a news conference here today, she favoured privatisation of the Lithuanian economy beginning in mid-October. She noted that before the beginning of privatisation, the republican parliament should discuss the corresponding bill.

Prunskiene believes several ways of privatisation are possible—to return property to former owners or pay compensation to them, sell shares to population, and other forms.

Asked about Lithuania's relations with the Soviet Union, she noted that the relations have "begun to worsen" especially after the the consultative meeting between delegations on October 20, where the sides discussed preparations for talks. She said she hoped that sides will be able to resolve the most acute problems in the nearest future.

Prunskiene said a meeting between the Baltic republics' prime ministers and the Soviet leadership is scheduled for November 11. She said future talks between Lithuania and the Soviet Union should be held in turn in Moscow and in Vilnius, and if necessary in other cities.

Landsbergis Receives Visiting Swedish Delegation

LD0311235990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] Swedish Moderate Unity Party Chairman, International Democrats' Party Deputy Chairman, Swedish Riksdag Deputy Carl Bildt, this party's secretary John Harsten, and Riksdag Deputy Gunnar Hokmark have arrived in Vilnius.

Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis received the visitors today. The Supreme Council chairman briefed the Swedish visitors on the situation in Lithuania and preparations for interstate negotiations with the Soviet Union.

In discussing the republic's relations with the Nordic Council, Vytautas Landsbergis noted that Scandinavian countries could provide more assistance to the Baltic countries in preparing for the Helsinki II meeting in Paris.

It was pointed out that much progress has been attained in relations with the Nordic Council. Representatives of the Baltic countries legislatures have been invited to the Nordic countries conference in Copenhagen.

The visitors expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to become acquainted with Lithuanian political life.

Supreme Council Deputy Chairman Bronislovas Kuzmickas and Kazimieras Motieka and Supreme Council Presidium members and deputies participated at the meeting.

Today, Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene also met with the visitors.

Lithuania's Ozolas Views Negotiation Prospects

LD0411100890 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] All legal and juridical preconditions exist for the start of negotiations between the Republic of Lithuania and the Soviet Union. Should the negotiations fail to begin after all, it could be stated that Lithuania's partners failed to demonstrate good will, stated Romualdas Ozolas, deputy prime minister and chief of the work group for preparation of the start of negotiations protocol. He said this today in a Lithuanian Television Russian- language program.

The work group for preparation of the start of negotiations protocol has now reached a decisive point where they are making final decisions, and on how the negotiations will continue once they have been started. Moreover, the negotiations will either commence or fail to commence during the last 10 days of November, remarked Romualdas Ozolas.

However, in his estimation possibilities exist for the start of negotiations since our quest for important new wording to legalize the Lithuanian side in the negotiations as an independent state, and as a state moreover that suffered during World War II, may be expressed in correct concepts acceptable to both sides. Everything will depend on whether or not some goodwill is demonstrated, said Romualdas Ozolas.

Union Bodies Refuse To Sign Lithuanian Deals

LD0411005390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Report by Rima Jakutyte]

[Text] Minister of Material Resource Romualdas Kozyrovicius, who has just returned from Moscow, has informed us that the Union State Planning Committee and other Union institutions are refusing to sign Lithuania's and the Soviet Union's material resource purchase and sales agreements for next year. These were agreed upon last week.

The Union government wants to see Lithuania within the Union and intends to decide supply questions by subsidies and on the aforementioned basis [within the Union], as was done previously.

The minister observed that this question may have to be resolved with the USSR president, since it is doubtful that common contact points can be found with the Union government.

Lithuania, Armenia Sign Cooperation Accord

LD0311232590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] An ELTA announcement—Armenia has become the sixth republic to establish economic ties with the Lithuanian Republic.

Today at the Government Building in Vilnius, Algirdas Brazauskas, deputy Lithuanian Prime Minister, and Grant Bagratyan, first deputy chairman of Armenia's Council of Ministers, signed an agreement between the government of the Lithuanian republic and the government of the Armenian republic on trade, economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation between 1991-1995.

This document provides for broad-based cooperation between the two republics in various areas. Extensive trade [word indistinct] building materials, wood products, light industry products, dairy products, fish products, household products, and chemical goods has been agreed upon.

Following the signing of the document, Grant Bagratyan told reporters that Armenia plans to enact similar agreements with all Soviet Union republics. Tomorrow, the visitor departs for Riga.

Conference Discusses Lithuanian Border Checks

PM0511113390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 1 Nov 90 First Edition p 3

[Dispatch by Captain Second Rank V. Gromak under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Which Duty To Perform?"]

[Text] Vilnius—The second session of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet is continuing its work. Several draft laws were presented at the 30 October morning sitting. Deputy M. Treynis provided information about the draft Law on Agricultural Societies. The deputies were also presented with a draft Lithuanian Republic Law on the Police. Z. Vayshvila, chairman of the commission for state security and internal affairs, presented draft laws on the territorial security service, and a provisional Law on Border Security Service.

V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, paid particular attention in his address to the problem connected with the fall draft of young people into the Soviet Army. He stressed that although the Supreme Soviet previously adopted resolutions on this subject, the legislature's line is insufficiently clear to the public. Bearing this in mind, the legislature adopted a relevant statement. It stresses that the USSR Army in Lithuania is part of the militarist system and ideology of another state which is now experiencing a deep crisis. The old mechanisms of compulsory military service are continuing to operate in it, and these are again being applied illegally in Lithuania. The republic does not prohibit young men from performing such service of their own free will. However, this must take place on a voluntary basis. The time is approaching, the statement says, when Lithuanian men will be drafted to serve their motherland and the Supreme Soviet has no doubt that everyone will respond and will eagerly perform their duty as citizens of the Lithuanian Republic.

What is this duty? It is proposed that young men will also perform customs service. A conference on questions of

the economic security of the borders for leaders of the self-government organs in border regions and some Lithuanian cities, and also the territorial defense departments and the Lithuanian customs service, was held in the republic government residence. The conference was led by Deputy Prime Minister A. Brazauskas. The conference was certain of the need to form as soon as possible a border economic security service to promote the stabilization of the internal market. However, we do not have a great deal at the moment apart from a map of the republic showing 64 checkpoints and 10 customs offices, Brazauskas said. Perhaps the customs officers from Lazdiyay, who put on their new uniforms in the past few days, are an exception. Alas even these were summer uniforms.

There were disputes at the conference as to what kind of people are best suited to this service and how the economic border security service should be staffed. The opinion was expressed that it would be a good idea to pay more attention to the opinion of the self-government organs in selecting candidates.

Lithuanian Pro-Moscow Communists Discuss Press

LD0411171890 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0934 GMT 4 Nov 90

[Text] Vilnius, 4 Nov (TASS)—Ensuring the publication and distribution of the party press and the Communist Party of Lithuania's tactics with regard to other political parties and public movements in the republic were the key issues at a recent meeting of the Central Committee Bureau of the Communist Party of Lithuania (CPSU).

Analyzing the state of affairs of the party press, Mikolas Burokyavicius, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania (CPSU), noted that the 'TARYBU LIETUVA' ('SOVIET LITHUANIA') and 'LITVA SOVETSKAYA' ('SOVIET LITHUANIA') newspapers as well as other town and rayon party publications play an outstanding role in stepping up the organizational and ideological work of the republic's party organizations, briefing its population about the most important events in the life of the Lithuanian Communist Party, and exposing attacks by anti-Soviet forces on the vital interests of the working people.

However, as became clear from the analysis by M. Burokyavicius, work to organize the publication of party newspapers is unsatisfactory in a number of areas. To date it is not possible to print 'TARYBU LIETUVA' and 'LITVA SOVETSKAYA' within the republic. Members of the Bureau were particularly alarmed by the fact that subscriptions to the party press are low, due to increased prices.

As noted at the meeting of the Bureau, the increase and greater strength of separatist and nationalistic tendencies within the republic, as well as a number of laws and decisions of the Supreme Council aimed at banning

progressive parties and movements, demand more flexible and well-thought-out tactics from the Communist Party of Lithuania (CPSU) in matters of consolidating all left-wing forces to protect socialist legality and the vital interests of the working people, to establish close ties between Soviet Lithuania and other Union republics, and to improve relations with the central authorities of the USSR.

An appropriate document was worked out in connection with this at the meeting.

Arts, Sciences Quarterly Published in Lithuania

*LD0311215390 Vilnius International Service in English
2230 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Text] A new quarterly, MOKSLAS LIR LIETUVA, has been published together with its English variant, SCIENCE, ARTS, and LITHUANIA. The publishers aim at uniting the efforts of Lithuanian scientists and intellectuals all over the world for the sake of independent Lithuania. The journal will acquaint the world reader with the past and present of Lithuania and the hopes of its peoples.

Tallinn Military Parade To Be Staged 7 Nov

*LD0511130890 Moscow World Service in English
1200 GMT 5 Nov 90*

[Text] In Estonia, passions continued to run high over the military parade to take place in Tallinn on Wednesday in honor of the 73d anniversary of the socialist revolution. The commander of the Tallinn garrison, Vice Admiral Belov, said the parade will be held by all means. He stressed that he is well aware of how complicated and contradictory the situation is in the republic and in the country, but he rules out the possibility of servicemen behaving to the people in any undue manner. I'd like everyone to understand one thing, said the vice admiral—7 November is our holiday and we want to mark it as a holiday.

Estonian Communist Party Leader Assesses Issues

*LD0511145990 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian
1800 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Report by correspondent Ain Saarna]

[Text] [Saarna] Two issues were on the agenda of the Communist Party, convening the 21st congress of the Communist Party of Estonia and organizing the republican economy for the near future. Enn-Arno Sillari, first secretary of the party's central committee, in his main report was very hard on [Prime Minister] Edgar Savisaar's government. The other rapporteur, (Ants Piltavik), Communist Party of Estonia councillor, did not lag behind either. However, things remained realistic and it was acknowledged that in today's Estonia the Communist Party is no longer a deciding force.

Estonia is approaching a catastrophe but the Communists are fighting for power within the party. Enn-Arno Sillari had in mind the haggling between the independent and the pro-Moscow communist parties. It is hoped, however, that the 21st congress will appease both. But the overall situation is also creating concern for Communists. What happened as a result of the national movement which unfolded toward the end of the '80s was that in fact nothing happened. This is precisely what Enn-Arno Sillari said in his report.

Here is an extract from his report.

[Begin Sillari recording] As said above, we have no real power to influence the Supreme Soviet. I hope to represent the opinion of all Central Committee members addressing the Supreme Soviet with an urgent appeal to be indeed the top body of power in Estonia and to execute power in the sphere of economy in the true interests of the people.

Another key issue, in our opinion, is the main direction in the policy which seeks to promote independence. One cannot indeed say if it is tragic or comical but what is becoming apparent through the press is that the most exciting foreign relations problem has most recently been why the deputy chairman of the security committee was present at the airport meeting the prime minister after his U.S. visit, and success in talks held with neighbors amounts only to satisfactory progress being made in building a shack for a customs point on the Latvian border. We have to acknowledge once again at a Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee plenum that the main issue upon which almost everything depends in the economy as well as in meeting the daily needs of the population and in advancing along the path of state independence is the state of our relations with the USSR central authorities and agreements with USSR republics. We have not taken a single step back in our support for our own statehood when we say this: Politics in the east is the determining factor, however unpopular this claim may be. However, this deciding factor does not show anywhere with those who are at present executing authority in Estonia. [end recording]

[Saarna] Taking over from here one has to acknowledge that even the Communist Party of Estonia, which has such wide experience in governing, does not have a specific vision of the near future in the Estonian economy. Perhaps the Communists' visions of the future will become clearer at the 21st congress of the Communist Party of Estonia which will take place on 15 and 16 December.

Estonian Plenum Discusses Economy, 21st Congress

*LD0211212790 Moscow TASS in English 2040 GMT
2 Nov 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn November 2 TASS—Today's plenary meeting of the Estonian Communist Party (ECP) Central

Committee recommended that the republican parliament and the government should not take decisions which may "help break the established economic relations between Estonia and other Soviet republics and regions".

In the opinion of Estonian Communists, the present economic slump can be overcome thanks to state regulation and coordination of economic relations with other states and Union republics and regions of the USSR.

It is planned to discuss and adopt a draft programme for top priority actions to pull out of the crisis at the 21st ECP congress which will be held on December 15-16.

A decision on its holding says that the congress is also "aimed at establishing an independent Estonian Communist party out of members recognising its programme and rules".

A decision to establish an independent CPE was adopted at the 20th congress last March. The decision triggered off the party's split. Some delegates supporting the idea of organisational unity with the Soviet Communist Party elected its own Central Committee.

The plenary meeting was attended by representatives of both wings of the Estonian Communist movement. The congress will show how real their rapprochement is in the face of the approaching crisis.

The party has to overcome its own crisis due to which Communists are deprived of a chance to influence changes in society.

CPSU Secretariat Greets Estonian Communists

*LD0211221290 Moscow TASS in English 1814 GMT
2 Nov 90*

[Text] Moscow November 2 TASS—The Secretariat of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee warmly congratulated the Communists and all those who hold dear the ideals of socialism, on the 70th anniversary of the Estonian Communist Party.

A telegram sent to the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist party and republican Communists notes that "the Estonian Communist Party founded in November 1920 has covered a difficult road.

"The Communists led the struggle of the Estonian proletariat for the liberation of working people, the establishment and consolidation of Soviet power in the republic.

"They were organisers of the struggle of Estonian people against Nazi invaders during the war years."

"In the post-war period," says the telegram circulated here today, "relying on the friendship and cooperation between all the peoples of the Soviet Union, Estonia

could revive the dislocated economy and create a rock-firm industrial and cultural potential, deeply integrated into the economic, social and political life of the multinational Soviet Union."

The Secretariat expressed confidence that "the Estonian Communist Party will successfully pass the present period of difficulties, conscious of its responsibility before the people.

"It will strengthen the traditions of internationalism, unity of the party and will consistently advocate democracy and social progress."

Riga City Committee Discusses 7 Nov Celebration

*LD0211212690 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
1000 GMT 2 Nov 90*

[Text] The Riga City Executive Committee, at its extraordinary session today, examined the application by the Democratic Union of Latvia and the resolution of the Executive Committee of the Council of People's Deputies of the Centra [of the center] Rayon number 360, and Order No 263 on organizing a meeting by this union on 7 November from 1600 to 1700 hours. As the initial site of the meeting its organizers had chosen the Latvian Riflemen's Square because the Latvian Red Riflemen took an active part in organizing the revolution of October 1917. The resolution of the Executive Committee of the Centra Rayon envisages moving the meeting to the Esplanade. Such a solution did not satisfy the Democratic Union of Latvia which submitted the application to the City Executive Committee. The resolution adopted by the Centra Rayon was regarded as justified by the Riga City Executive Committee.

RSFSR

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Activities Reported

New Publication Viewed

*LD0411190990 Moscow Television Service
in Russian 1530 GMT 4 Nov 90*

[Interview with Valentin Andreyevich Logunov, deputy minister of the press and mass media of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, by Vladimir Stepanyuk, on the publication by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet paper ROSSISKAYA GAZETA; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Stepanyuk] Valentin Andreyevich, first of all, about what concerns your future reader: the circulation of your paper. Will it be sold by retail for the time being, and can it be subscribed to this year?

[Logunov] In the course of the next two months we will not be publishing very regularly, at least until the Congress of People's Deputies begins. The initial circulation will be 200,000 and distribution will be chiefly here in Moscow. After the 15 or 20 November, we will bring out

an additional 200,000 or so copies of the paper and will send it to the nearest cities in the western part. Then we will send roughly another 100,000 copies beyond the Urals and to Siberia. Then subscriptions will begin—we will soon be announcing it—with deliveries from February, and the circulation will be determined according to readers' demand.

[Stepanyuk] Are any other Russian publications being prepared?

[Logunov] Yes. We have already, strictly speaking, begun preparing the first edition of the PRAVITEL-STVENNAYA GAZETA for publication. It is to be a weekly of 16 small-format pages. Russia and the Moscow Soviet, incidentally, have, as they say, nothing, not one linotype composing machine here in Moscow. For this reason, we have concluded a contract with the party's Central Committee on printing these newspapers on the printing machines of MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA which belongs to the Central Committee. Then we will complete construction of the second stage of our building of 32,000 square meters and fit it out. We will then achieve 40 percent of production capacity, of the whole volume, incidentally, of the whole volume, of the whole publishing house complex, and there we will begin the printing of new publications, up to a limit of 10 publications, newspapers and journals, or perhaps a few more.

Deputies Called Soviet Power 'Pallbearers'

PM0511150790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 2 Nov 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by TASS legislative correspondents N. Kupriy and R. Karyakin: "In Role of Pallbearers: At RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session"]

[Text] Deputies at the 1 November sitting of the Soviet of the Republic were serving as the pallbearers of Soviet power. The sitting examined the draft RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Constitution. Meanwhile, a sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities was discussing the federal treaty.

The Soviet of the Republic sitting was opened by O.G. Rummyantsev, secretary of the Constitutional Commission and leader of the group working on drafting this document. He acquainted those present with progress in the legislative process. Then he said that he is aware of the preparation of an alternative draft Constitution which is being elaborated by the Russian Communist bloc. It will be bad if we are given two conflicting drafts at the forthcoming Congress of People's Deputies. We have already tried to cross a hedgehog with a snake in the economic reform program. Two months have passed. Much time has already been lost.

"The old Constitution is no good and cannot be amended," Ye.A. Ambartsumov, a member of the Constitutional Commission's working group, told the sitting.

Deputy S.N. Yushenkov added to that speaker's comment:

"Concepts such as Soviet power and socialism have disappeared from our draft Constitution."

He suggested that they not imitate the heroes of Andrey Platonov by digging a common pit but that Soviet power and socialism be buried without fail.

It is surprising that the pallbearers among the people's deputies did not ask the people before performing the funeral march; maybe the people have a different song to sing on this score.

Some of the deputies who spoke subsequently warned about that, incidentally. They noted that the draft Constitution is antipeople in character.

There was a proposal on a referendum, but a decision has not been taken yet.

At the same time as the Soviet of the Republic was beginning to bury Soviet power and socialism, the sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities was burying the federal treaty.

The following idea was expressed there: The federal treaty is a pretext for destroying the federation. We have lived 100 years without one and we shall continue to do so.

It was proposed that further work be done on the document and that it be submitted to the scrutiny of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The second option is to create a commission to prepare a declaration on the national-state system and submit that to the Presidium's examination as well.

On this day, just before 7 November, deputies received their holiday food orders. Even those who do not intend to mark the 73d October anniversary did not refuse them. But it is characteristic that on the first day of November, which the session proclaimed as day one of the operation of market relations, the produce was bought at state prices. Just as a few days ago, furthermore, they hurried to buy at state prices cars which they intend to use not just for "personal purposes but for official purposes, too."

The logical question here is how the deputies demanded that people give up all these goodies. Did they strictly and relentlessly unmask everyone, but when it came to themselves...?

Journalists showed genuine interest in the distribution of the food orders and clarified why it is that deputies alone deserve such attention. They concluded that it is solely because they are people's deputies. Perhaps this defining epithet should be removed? Perhaps the voters should reflect on that? After all it is certain that the people who really will commemorate the date of the October Revolution will not have the "deputy's menu" on their tables....

Thus ended another day's work at the session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on the eve of fall holidays which will last almost as long as the school vacation.

Resolution on Pulp, Paper Distribution

PM0611104090 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 1 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[“RSFSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on the Exclusive Right of Organs of RSFSR State Administration to Distribution of Paper and Pulp Output Produced in the Russian Federation”—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] In view of the fact that the existing practice of distributing paper and pulp output produced on the republic's territory without agreement with the relevant RSFSR organs is contrary to the Russian Federation's sovereignty, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To establish that the state order for the production of paper and pulp output in the RSFSR is determined by the RSFSR Council of Ministers, or by other organs of state administration with its authorization.

The state order is formulated on the basis of the Russian Federation's requirements, its commitments under interrepublic and foreign economic agreements and deals, and also taking into account all-Union needs.

2. To instruct the RSFSR Council of Ministers to elaborate and establish within a month a procedure for distributing paper and pulp output to consumers, together with proposals for reviewing agreements and deals stipulated in Point 1 of the present resolution and delivery contracts concluded before its entry into force.

[Signed] R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

[Dated] Moscow, RSFSR House of Soviets, 24 October 1990.

Resolution on Economic Program

PM0211144990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 2 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[RSFSR Supreme Soviet Resolution: “On Beginning the Implementation of the Republic Program for Stabilizing the Economy and the Transition to Market Relations”]

[Text] After hearing the report of Comrade I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves

1. That as of 1 November this year the RSFSR Council of Ministers shall begin the implementation of the measures proposed by it to ensure fulfillment of the program for the stabilization of the economy and the transition to market relations.

2. On the basis of the Declaration on the State Sovereignty of the RSFSR and the RSFSR laws adopted since the beginning of its implementation, the RSFSR

Supreme Soviet Presidium and the RSFSR Council of Ministers shall implement measures for cooperation with other Union republics, the USSR president, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers aimed at ensuring the necessary conditions for the fulfillment of the republic program for stabilizing the economy and the transition to market relations.

3. In November this year the RSFSR Council of Ministers shall complete the conclusion of economic agreements with the Union republics and ensure their implementation.

Standing interrepublic mixed economic commissions are to be formed by mutual agreement for the coordination of actions.

4. To agree with the RSFSR Council of Ministers proposal on the creation of a Federal Economic Committee.

In the light of the changed conditions for the implementation of the program, the RSFSR Council of Ministers is to present proposals to improve the management structure of the RSFSR national economy and submit the relevant proposals to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet within 1 month.

5. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the RSFSR Council of Ministers shall report to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet monthly on progress in implementing the program.

[Signed] R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

[Dated] House of the RSFSR Soviets, Moscow. 31 October 1990.

Yeltsin Visits Sverdlovsk Explosion Victims' Graves

LD0511122890 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0837 GMT 5 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Nadezhda Potapova]

[Text] Sverdlovsk, Nov (TASS)—Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, laid a wreath today at the graves of workers who died in the explosion at a chemical factory close to the Urals town of Asbest. He flew here early this morning and immediately left for the scene of the tragedy where a civil memorial service was held.

The explosion took place at the end of a shift on 1 November. The unit storing the industry's explosives blew up. Six people were killed and 22 wounded and taken to hospital. The remains of several others were later brought out from under the rubble.

Boris Yeltsin visited the site of the explosion and talked to members of the commission which is investigating the cause of the tragedy.

Yeltsin Discusses Center-Republic Relations

91UN0155A Kiev KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA
in Russian 30 Sep 90 p 8-9

[Interview with Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, by Vadim Dolganov, KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA legislative correspondent, in Moscow; date not given: "Boris Yeltsin: 'There Is Sabotage'"]

[Text] Yeltsin is never afraid of "tough" questions. He does not dodge meetings with legislators or journalists. He goes (flies, drives, sails) to his voters himself. It seems that the secret of Yeltsin's popularity among the people, his success as a politician, is hidden in his openness. The conversation whose transcript we publish today took place during days of "great resistance": the Russian parliament on the one hand and the all-union Supreme Soviet on the other. Incidentally, such "resistance" is unfortunately already becoming a permanent condition of the capital's political life.

There were several other aspects that could have prevented this conversation (but they did not interfere). A few days before our talk there was held in Moscow a mass demonstration of city dwellers whose chief slogan had become, "Down with the Ryzhkov cabinet!". At the same time, and unknown as to by whose order, assault units from Ryazan were "actively deployed." Assault troops in bullet-proof vests with entrenching tools were moved to Moscow by someone's hand. Yeltsin was informed in time. Yeltsin gathered the commanders of the military districts. Yeltsin explained to them that the lawful power in Russia is now the parliament. And on the day this conversation took place there crept through the capital a rumor that the chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet had been in a car accident. The phones rang off the hook at the editorial offices of the central newspapers; Muscovites call the television stations. The rumor proved to be just that. But...literally only a few hours later, the following morning, an accident took place.

A 55-year-old retiree with 27 years' driving experience "smashed" into the side of Yeltsin's car. They say it is a miracle Boris Nikolayevich survived: At the moment of impact, the vehicle had just gone into a left turn.

This is the atmosphere in which he lives, works, and struggles. These are the circumstances under which he attempts to discern the obstacles on the well-trod Russian path, a path noticeably beaten over the last 70 years.

One more event that must be mentioned: the publication of B.N. Yeltsin's book, "Confession on a Given Topic." At the Kremlin stall where it was on sale there stood in line dozens of all-union legislators, among them those who are taking pleasure in the "accusation and unmasking" of Yeltsin.

[Yeltsin] You know the results of the First Congress of Russian People's Deputies. In the work of the RSFSR

Supreme Soviet, we will proceed from these results; we will be guided by the conclusions drawn at the first Congress.

[Dolganov] Is there any sort of "main" decision?

[Yeltsin] Yes. There is the Declaration of Russian State Sovereignty. And there is a second one: the decision on the division of functions between the center and Russia in all spheres of our activity. These are the two fundamental documents. In the development of these documents, the Russian legislature is concerned with legislative activity; work is being conducted in committees and commissions, chambers, and, well, in the joint session of the chambers, the sessions of the Russian Supreme Soviet.

[Dolganov] The second session of the republic legislature began its work on 3 September. What are the main things under discussion and to be discussed during this session?

[Yeltsin] We want to consider a large package of laws associated with the program for economic stabilization and the transition to market relations. You know that for the most part, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet approved the program prepared by the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy group at the President's decision. And at our proposal, this group completed the development of the program by 1 September.

[Dolganov] Why by the first? Could this be the usual "dated" program?

[Yeltsin] We wanted to have a version of this concept by the beginning of the session, so the proposal originated with us. Yet the basic concept of the transition to a market, economic stabilization cannot be realized solely within the framework of the Russian Federation. For, if it is possible to realize this only with the framework of a single republic, then it is necessary to have our own bank note, our own hard currency, customs, borders, and many, many other things. We would then simply become the initiators of the collapse of the state. Naturally, not only do we not wish to be such initiators, but on the contrary, we wish to participate as much as possible in the creation of the Union, its fortification. And, perhaps even in its consolidation around Russia and other republics for the overall strengthening of our country. But considering that we could not go for the union government program, with the negative attitude toward on the part of the majority of Russians [rossiyane], with the serious shortcomings inherent in it (you know them well), it was proposed to the president: Let us create a group on the basis of the concept of this program. Relying upon this concept, let the group work out a union program for economic stabilization and the transition to a market. When this work was executed, the Russian Supreme Soviet discussed and approved it. It did not confirm it, but specifically approved it, since this is a union program.

[Dolganov] What do you have in mind by the concept of "union" in this case?

[Yeltsin] That the market is not Russian, but encompasses the entire Union.

We requested the USSR Supreme Soviet and the republic legislatures to support our proposal, to consider specifically this program. And that they express their attitude toward just this program, and afterward, that the parliament move toward adopting the Shatalin program. After which the Russian Council of Ministers would develop a program of concrete measures to realize this program within the territory of Russia. That is the plan that has been set up, and we move according to it.

[Dolganov] As we now know, the next step of the Russian legislature is the demand that Ryzhkov's cabinet resign.

[Yeltsin] It was a very firm proposal by the people's deputies, favored by the majority of their number (the voting showed that the overwhelming majority favor this), that considering the work of the USSR Government over five years, considering the fact that negative processes are burgeoning, people's dissatisfaction with the ineffectiveness of the Union Government is growing and will grow, with the fact that it cannot realize a program it has not developed, but criticizes without recognizing it, and will undoubtedly thwart and sabotage it in every way possible, to demand the resignation of the cabinet of ministers. This decision was made with consideration for all the fine points of the regulations, without violating them one iota. And the appropriate decree was signed the following day. We feel that such a step is justified at this moment. Incidentally, this issue was discussed during our personal one-to-one meeting with Gorbachev over the course of five hours. Of course, the president requested that this issues be resolved not quite immediately, nor was he resolved even immediately after the meeting. He was resolved after a certain period of time. But we felt that this problem should not be dragged out. And the resignation of the Union Government would somehow help untangle the knot in the consideration and confirmation of the program for the transition to the market, since potential tension is growing, and the people are simply saying well, give us a program so that it can be achieved; let us get to work, and learn that there are glimmers of hope planned for the near future. Dragging out the confirmation of this program for a month or two will even more seriously aggravate the situation in Russia and in the country as a whole.

[Dolganov] You said that the issue of dividing the functions of the union and republic organs of power is one of the most important issues for the Russian legislature.

[Yeltsin] After the adoption of the Declaration, this is a very serious question, that of dividing the functions between the center and Russia. We have transferred to the Union the functions of six ministries: Defense, the KGB, Communications, Aeroflot, Power Engineering, including nuclear, and rail transportation. We refused

the services of the remaining ministries, about 60 of them. We feel that we must, accordingly, divide the property and functions of these ministries within the territory of Russia. But on the republic level we will not let these ministries go, since for independent enterprises, for independent local soviets it makes no difference what kind of bureaucracy there will be, the union level or the republic level. Therefore we will not repeat the structures that have been rejected at the union level; we will not copy them at the Russian level. We have no intention of creating at the Russian level a single ministry similar to a union one whose services we have declined. We have just one ministry that unites all these functions. It is called the Ministry of Industry, Transportation, and Communications.

Incidentally, it is appropriate here to make a small digression which to my mind characterizes the specifics of the "Yeltsin team" fairly well. Silayev, who has clearly hitched his wagon to his own, Russian president rather than the union one, recommended to the office of minister of industry, transportation, and communications Viktor Kisin, until recently an engineer at the Moscow Automobile Plant, an "informal" leader who beat several apparatus proteges simultaneously in the elections to USSR people's deputy. But let us return to Yeltsin's story, turning on the microphone:

[Yeltsin] We feel that independence must be given at the bottom, to the rayon soviet, other local soviets of people's deputies. Correspondingly, to enterprises, organizations, associations, or concerns, and so on. This process will undoubtedly move with difficulty. The union departments either proceed with difficulty or sabotage the signing of our protocols on the division of functions. We came to a quicker agreement on the division even with the KGB. Not too long ago, committee Chairman Kryuchkov was here in this office. And we came to an agreement on the delegation of powers to him from Russia, and on the creation of a republic organ of security. We will get back to what we will call it. But in principle, it has been decided to divide these functions. We came to an agreement with the minister of internal affairs on the division of functions. So, the RSFSR MVD has not been abolished, rather we have come to an agreement with Minister Bakatin. Things are more complicated with other issues.

[Dolganov] And what is particularly complicated?

[Yeltsin] The raw materials issue. Petroleum, natural gas, gold, other metals. Since on many of these issues, Russia does not even know to what degree it is participating and to what degree it owns these resources, and correspondingly, the production reserves. We insist that everything within the Russian territory that we have not transferred to union organs is RSFSR property in accordance with the processed production. Only Russia is to allocate this production through its organs, organizations, and so on.

We do not want to deduct that 70 billion that today simply goes beyond the Russian borders on an annual basis, that few billion in hard currency that also floats away beyond our republic's borders. We do not wish to participate in the realization of union programs without a strict accounting of what share Russia must contribute (and receive) in any such program. We understand that these are very complicated problems. But this is exactly how everything is developing. Many republics, including the Ukraine, have adopted a Declaration of state sovereignty. They are taking the same path. And this is an inevitable historical fact. All the union organs must reckon with this.

[Dolganov] Do you see in connection with this a path toward a radical alteration of the functions of the union organs of administration?

[Yeltsin] In adopting the decree on the program, we entrusted the Russian Council of Ministers in conjunction with the committees and commissions of the republic parliament to work out the proposals for the alteration of the system of state power and administration in the country, then introduce them to the Union Supreme Soviet. We feel that the union Government is not necessary in the form in which it now functions. And considering that the republics are shouldering a large part of the burden, the majority of branch ministries must be abolished. Perhaps a prime minister isn't necessary, either. A compact cabinet under the country's president is needed.

Here again I cannot refrain from another digression. In August, when I discussed these same topics with Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman Vladimir Grinev, his utterances were made in the same spirit. Meaning that these ideas were in no way the attempts of "certain people" to tear apart the "indestructible union," but the call of the time. Of that very same time in which the various regions of the country, squeezed under the heel of the administrative-command system for many decades, are declaring themselves more actively. And the new leaders of these republics and autonomous formations are simply expressing what is in the air.

[Yeltsin] For the time being, our proposals are of a preliminary nature. We will still discuss them at the Russian Supreme Soviet and only afterwards will we introduce them to the all-Union legislature.

[Dolganov] We know that not everything is falling into place so smoothly. Opposition to the republic initiative is being felt even in Kiev. It probably cannot but be felt in the Russian legislature.

[Yeltsin] Naturally there is an entire range of aspects that seriously trouble us. Particularly the fact that the president has adopted a number of orders infringing upon the sovereignty of Russian. I am speaking about Russia in this case. This causes not only bewilderment but indignation on the part of the Russians and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. You will recall the revocation of the republic legislative decree on the defense of economic

sovereignty, which in effect was vetoed by the president. When I met with him, we decided together that this is a political incident, and it must not be repeated. Yet on the other hand, we already have a draft decree introduced by a group of people's deputies on halting the point of the president's second order on the property of the Academy of Sciences.

[Dolganov] I will clarify that literally one day after this conversation, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet confirmed this decree practically unanimously, with only a few abstentions.

[Yeltsin] We considered this encroachment on the sovereignty of Russia, since among the holdings of the USSR Academy of Sciences there is a significant amount of Russian property. Therefore the president alone does not have the right to distribute it. This is a typical example: We have to sort things out before giving away great material valuables to a group of people. And the USSR Academy of Sciences is one such group. We consider such a step incompetent.

[Dolganov] More about another problem that troubles Ukrainians as well. I have in mind young men serving in the army, the MVD, the KGB. What do you see as the solution?

[Yeltsin] It seems to me that everything is simple here. The power of Russians cannot be used in the resolution of interethnic conflicts beyond the republic's borders. You know the results of the congress of mothers of dead soldiers, who called upon the president, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the Russian legislature to cease using young men as cannon fodder in our peaceful, though troubled times. There is no such strict demand that our boys serve only within Russian territory in the decree of the Russian legislature, the draft of which was developed and discussed in committees and commissions; it is simply stated that soldiers' participation in interethnic discord in other regions of the country is not permitted. We feel that if the need arises, the republic leadership, the Supreme Soviets must create special inter-republic troops for the resolution of such conflicts. Yet such subdivisions must be formed only on a voluntary basis.

[Dolganov] What are the immediate plans of the Russian legislature?

[Yeltsin] In October, we plan to adopt 15 laws connected with the stabilization of the economy and the transition to market relations. We hope that five of the laws from the "economic package" will also be adopted by the fourth session of the USSR legislature. This will be our main concern in October. Of course, we had intended to start counting the 500 days from 1 October. But now we see that the republic Supreme Soviets, including the Russian one, will not have prepared the necessary draft laws. That is why we have to start the count from 1 November. This is the most realistic thing.

Incidentally, I would note that the Russian legislature should learn from both from the positive things and the mistakes of the country's Supreme Soviet to try not to make any (or fewer) itself. It is already clear that we cannot have "one-to-one" ratification of many of the laws adopted by the Union Supreme Soviet. Of course, time has played its role here, too, but certain errors have been committed by the all-Union legislature. In addition, each republic has its peculiarities, its specifics. That is why the Russian legislature will adopt its own laws somewhat distinct from the union ones, while considering them as prevailing over the latter. We speak of laws on property, enterprises, entrepreneurial activity, taxation, land, and peasants' farms. And a number of others.

[Dolganov] There are in the body of the all-Union legislature many deputies elected from Russia. What do you see as forms of their cooperation with the republic supreme soviets?

[Yeltsin] I have already spoken on the development of laws. I think that they will be adopted in a somewhat different version, and through the deputies' joint efforts.

You will recall that back in spring we still had not decided to speak of private property in the all-Union law. But life has shown that we must move toward private property. Moreover, we have to find forms of contact with all-union parliamentarians in order that we not adopt different laws simultaneously. Let us say, the current Russian law is even called "On freedom of religious confession," and the union law, "On freedom of conscience in religious confession," that is, different concepts are laid in from the very beginning. I think that in discussing such laws we must work together in committees and commissions. I hope that we can do such joint work. Otherwise, it may be amusing to both the whole world and to the country when we begin to adopt different laws only a few days apart. We have to try to bring them closer, although naturally, differences cannot be avoided. Moreover, I consider it necessary to hold meetings such as the one that recently took place in the Russian Supreme Soviet. We invited to it the USSR people's deputies elected from within the territory of our republic. This is also a form of interaction in the legislative process.

[Dolganov] Ryzhkov, Abalkin, and many of those who support them assert that the majority of the population will suffer during the process of the transition to market relations. Is the Russian legislature planning to develop and adopt any sort of wide-scale social programs?

[Yeltsin] Our legislature is preparing such a law on social guarantees, particularly for people living on fixed incomes and retirees. Without a doubt, it will not raise the "ceiling" on pensions and payments determined by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Yet there are two viewpoints regarding the pension fund. One is that the all-union fund alone is sufficient. The other is that it is necessary to have our own as well in addition to this. Until now

there has been no final decision. Apparently, it will appear during the deputies' discussion of the draft.

[Dolganov] I would like to return to that 1 October date. Other mass information media said straight away that putting off the beginning of the "500 day" program was a concession by Yeltsin and his "team." You have already spoken about this. Yet it seems that there is sense in putting it in more detail.

[Yeltsin] When we discussed the decree for the program, one of the points there was an appeal to the republic Supreme Soviets to consider the concept of the transition to market relations in the economy. Certain RSFSR people's deputies spoke in favor of proposing to the fellow legislators that they discuss the Shatalin program in September. But we considered this unethical, to appeal to the highest organs of power of sovereign republics and assign them deadlines. That is why we wrote in there, "in the near future." But only the USSR Supreme Soviet is empowered to determine the deadline for consideration in the republics. But as chairman, I contacted other chairmen and we agreed in principle to consider the program in September. There has appeared a version (it cannot be called a third program) compiled by a conciliation commission under the leadership of Aganbegyan. It is this one that has been sent to the republic supreme soviets for discussion. Practically speaking, this is at least 95 percent or more our program, even though a portion of the positions included in or excluded from it have a number of principally different readings with which we cannot agree. We have already expressed our opinion.

For example, there has been discussion of the primacy of republic law in the places where declarations of state sovereignty have been passed. This is excluded in the Aganbegyan version. An entirely different formulation, with which we cannot agree, has been made. But I think that there are only two or three such issues, and the program can be adopted even in such a version. It is possible that certain republics will start discussing the government's program; this cannot be excluded, either. As far as I know, Kirghizia will do so, but this is already a matter for the union republics and their Supreme Soviets. However, if different programs are adopted, neither one nor the other will be implemented. There will be no sense to them. Or then, as we would not wish to, we will start toward the realization of the Shatalin program only within Russia.

[Dolganov] The Ministry of Health is not on the list of all-union ministries you cited. Is this a principle position of the parliament not to delegate these functions to the center, or something else?

[Yeltsin] This is a problem that is now under discussion. I spoke of that subject with Russian Federation Minister of Health Kalinin just yesterday. I will permit myself to express my own point of view. It seems to me that we must retain this department, but radically alter its functions. It should have no ordering functions. It must have

science, the study of forecasting, contacts with international organizations, epidemiological services, and the suchlike. But the reformation of medicine must be approached carefully in order not to lose the capital of medical science and practice already accumulated.

[Dolganov] And what are the long-term prospects for the development of public education in Russia?

[Yeltsin] A state program is now being worked out. We have in mind a review of a number of serious principle positions in this issue. As far as the union functions are concerned, we are against the administration of public education and VUZ's [higher educational institution] being exercised from the center. This is the concern of each republic.

[Dolganov] The following question seems natural: Culture?

[Yeltsin] In the very near future, we would like to appeal to compatriots abroad, since the majority of them wound up outside of Russia through no fault of their own, but rather as the result of the circumstances of our past life. We hope that they will help in Russia's renaissance. First and foremost, we hope for intellectual aid. This is the first thing. Secondly, to create a special hard currency fund for the renaissance of Russia. In addition, we want to call anyone who so desires to return to the fatherland. We will restore citizenship accordingly, although every individual case must be considered individually.

[Dolganov] Boris Nikolayevich, the shortage of the bulk of basic consumer goods has reached simply colossal proportions. Even in Moscow, where a service system based on the consumers' "business cards" has been introduced, there is practically nothing to buy without standing forever in huge lines. And at the same time, they continue to fill the NZ [reserved fund] warehouses. How should this be taken?

[Yeltsin] Of course, there is a problem. But state resources and reserves are allocated by the Union. We must get back to this, examine the problem. The same way we have to divide the gold, hard currency, we have to regard the resources. But we now feel that the way out of this situation is as follows. To somehow agitate the regions that are not supplying goods, but should be supplying them according to the plan. To request that they meet the planned shipments this year. Under the transition to the market, it will be another matter, then there will be another evaluation. For the time being, the plan is in effect. Even though a number of measures to stimulate harvest laborers has been passed, the situation today is extremely tense. But a great quantity of wheat will be harvested. 1978 was a record year, and we are currently close to its results. We will get something around 125 million metric tons. This will lower the tension somewhat, including tension livestock breeding. But considering that the union Government adopted excessive purchase prices for grain, and stock breeding seems to have become a side branch, to correct this imbalance we were forced to move toward increasing

purchase prices for livestock products. That is, purchase prices, with retail prices unchanged.

[Dolganov] But that is how market prices for meat are edged up.

[Yeltsin] We were not the ones who nudged them up by raising bread prices. But in this situation, the branch would perish if prices for livestock products were not raised. All the same, I covered most of Russia over 22 days. I heard plenty of bad things, but a heap of advice too.

We want to buy meat and butter abroad in order to provide food products to the regions where agriculture is not developed, where there are major industrial centers (there are four or five such centers). All the more so because Russia is now being given credit. Not too much to the union, but Russia is getting credit, and at a fairly low rate; sometimes without any interest. And even with the low interest rate, it's over 10-20 years of payment. We are now buying meat from FRG; we have an agreement with Holland, though we want to tie up a few loose ends. Overall, though, this is very, very hard to do.

[Dolganov] Is the delivery of foodstuffs to Russia from other republics continuing? I know that the Ukraine had adopted an order about "non-export" beyond the territory's border.

[Yeltsin] Yes, other union republics are delivering practically nothing. Even though Russia has been subsidizing all the time. I hope that we manage to achieve self-provision for the republic by inculcating the new economic system. The republic has everything it needs for this.

[Dolganov] Incidentally, why do the disruptions suddenly arise, first bread, then tobacco?

[Yeltsin] The disruptions are often groundless; they can often be brushed away to see genuine sabotage. Because everything is happening according to the same pattern. Take, for example, the disruption with bread. First in Moscow, then in Kiev. The same pattern! One bakery shut down because a production line was not working. But 100 trucks are waiting in the lot. Another bakery shut down because there were no trucks. And so six bakeries shut down. At the same time! The same thing was repeated in Kiev. There is no need to doubt or exclude that there are elements of sabotage here.

[Dolganov] If it is no secret, what did you talk about with Gorbachev face-to-face?

[Yeltsin] I sat with him for five hours. It was a long time; we discussed some 40 questions that I had, that Gorbachev had. During these five hours, we dotted practically all the "i's." Even though we remembered some of what once spoiled our moods concerning one another, at the present time we decided to put all personal things aside. I did, and he did, as the leaders of two states, the union state and the Russian state. To build relations on a businesslike basis, on the basis of negotiations, on the

basis of a dialogue, to cooperate, to discuss problems together. Naturally, not to the detriment of the interests and sovereignty of Russia. And to attempt to somehow coordinate our actions. Or at least to try to avoid confrontation.

Getting ahead, I would note that probably, the two leaders of the perestroika era still did not come to terms on everything during their personal meeting. Otherwise, how can the confrontation outlined in recent days between the all-Union and Russian legislatures be explained? We recall that the union deputies adopted the law on the special rights of the president after long debate and arguments, and then only for an undetermined, "transitional" period. In turn, the Presidium of the Russian Supreme Soviet interpreted, and not without grounds, the "special powers" as an opportunity to interfere in the internal affairs of the RSFSR. However, this act, enforced by the pressing of buttons on the deputies' tables in the Kremlin, led to bewilderment not only in the Russian, but in the Ukrainian legislatures. An unprecedented incident. All the more so because Gorbachev constantly criticizes and rebukes the administrative systems. Thus, we have here not simply a matter of the personal qualities of Yeltsin and his dislike for Gorbachev. I would not like to forecast the development of events, but in this case I have no doubt that the Ukrainian legislature may not turn up on the same side of the barricade as the President.

[Dolganov] And the final question. How do you feel about Solzhenitsyn's ideas for the restructuring of Russia?

[Yeltsin] We made special copies of that work and handed them out to all the people's deputies, so that they could read it very carefully. It contains many interesting thoughts, which should be considered fully. Of course, there is something to consider. Including the fact that Russia is in no condition to feed one-sixth of the world's land mass.

Reform Program To Increase Kamchatka Unemployed

PM0511122390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 90 p 2

[SIBINFORM report: "Peninsula Without Work"]

[Text] The SIBINFORM correspondent has been informed by the Kamchatka Oblast Job Placement, Retraining, and Career Guidance Center that there are currently 5,815 people temporarily unemployed in the oblast.

Specialists from the center assume that during the implementation of the "500 Days" Program 22,000 inhabitants of the peninsula will be made redundant merely through the closure of loss-making enterprises in the oblast.

RSFSR Politburo Meets With Local Leaders

PM0511164390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 1 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the rubric "In the RSFSR, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, Communist Party": "Loyalty to Choice"]

[Text] Members of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee Politburo have met with leaders of republican, kray, and oblast Communist Party committees. An exchange of opinions on current political issues took place.

Central Committee Secretary I.I. Antonovich touched on the subject of the problems of working in conditions of a multiparty system and an emerging opposition. In particular, he analyzed the results of the recently held congress of the "Democratic Russia" movement, and also the congresses of the Russian Social Democratic Party and the Russian Christian Democratic Movement.

The rigid, uncompromising tenor of the program documents adopted by these congresses is striking. Essentially, they call for opposition to the CPSU in all spheres of social life, for the constitutional organs of power—the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Union government—to be undermined, and for civil disobedience. The anticommunist course proclaimed by "Democratic Russia" poses a threat to the foundations of the existence of the socialist state and is fraught with the danger of chaos, anarchy, and civil war.

It was stressed that the RSFSR Communist Party is not abandoning the search for points of contact with various public associations in the solution of urgent political, socioeconomic, ecological, and other problems. It sincerely intends to widen the scope of constructive dialogue. At the same time it will openly dissociate itself from antisocialist and separatist formations and resolutely oppose anticommunist forces.

The RSFSR Communist Party will remain faithful to the socialist choice and will unwaveringly defend the interests of the working people in conditions of transition to a regulated market economy.

Central Committee Secretary G.A. Zyuganov analyzed the progress of discussion in republic party organizations of the draft Basic Guidelines for the Activity of the RSFSR Communist Party.

The document was drafted by a group of Central Committee members—social scientists—on the basis of the decisions of the Founding Congress. The draft encapsulates numerous proposals from RSFSR Communists and party organizations on vital issues of party renewal and the party's role and place in dynamic political and social processes. An assessment was made of the situation in the republic and the country, and the problems which

worry people were indicated—ways of switching to regulated market relations, democratizing public life, reviving culture, and enriching the entire spiritual sphere.

The reaction gives grounds for the conclusion that Communists share the main idea of stopping the country's slide toward catastrophe, stabilizing the sociopolitical situation, channeling perestroika in the direction of creation, and uniting all true democratic forces for this purpose. At the same time—and people speak and write about this at local level—further serious and fundamental work on the document is required. It is a question not so much of refining the formulas as of creating an effective mechanism for the realization of party policy.

It is important to ensure that, in the course of discussion, party organizations define specific work plans in the light of local conditions. To turn from words to vigorous action—this is how the thrust of the discussion of the draft Basic Guidelines for the Activity of the RSFSR Communist Party should be defined.

The speech of Central Committee Secretary A.S. Sokolov was devoted to problems of increasing the role of Communists in soviets of people's deputies. Certain questions pertaining to preparation for the Second Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies were also touched on. It was emphasized that in multiparty conditions the responsibility of the Communist Party for the fate of the Soviet state is growing. Party organizations' main task at the present time is to support Communist deputies in the performance of their duties and in strengthening their ties with voters and to provide broad coverage of deputies' activity in the local media. Labor collectives, scientists, and specialists must help Communist deputies to define their positions on crucial draft laws. Proposals on the organizational formalization of party factions in soviets at all levels and the need to strengthen party discipline were voiced. Directions for strengthening deputies' contacts with their party committees were determined.

The following took part in the discussion of the issues: I.A. Gorbunov, first secretary of Bashkir republic party committee; S.A. Osminin, first secretary of Kirov Obkom [oblast party committee]; A.M. Anipkin, first secretary of Volgograd Obkom; A.I. Seleznev, first secretary of Kursk Obkom; Yu.N. Semenov, first secretary of Kaliningrad Obkom; V.T. Suslin, first secretary of Rostov Obkom; U.Ye. Temirov, second secretary of Karachayevo-Cherkess Obkom; Ye.A. Vavilin, secretary of Novosibirsk Obkom; and V.V. Chikin, chief editor of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. They talked frankly of the trenchant assessments of the sociopolitical situation in the country made at local level, the critical remarks voiced at party conferences, and the proposals addressed to the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee.

Speeches were made to the meeting by I.K. Polozkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and

first secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, and V.A. Kuptsov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Such meetings with party committee first secretaries will become a regular event.

Silayev, ROK Businessmen Discuss Trade Issues

*LD0311235390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 3 Nov 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Ivan Stepanovich Silayev received the managers of the major South Korean corporation Hyundai today. The Russian Government has decided to purchase a large batch of clothing, footwear, household electrical appliances, and also motor vehicle tires and batteries offered by the corporation to back up the Harvest-90 coupons with commodities.

I would remind you that these coupons are issued to workers on collective and state farms, agro-industrial enterprises, and private peasant subsidiary farms for the sale of produce to the state, and also to urban dwellers for participation in taking in the harvest. The coupons guarantee acquisition of goods in high demand at retail prices. In payment for South Korean goods, the Russian Republic will supply Hyundai with crude oil and other natural resources.

Hyundai President Cited

*LD0511222490 Moscow TASS in English 2148 GMT
5 Nov 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow November 6 TASS—The "trade agreement" signed on November 1 by the Russian Federation's government and the South Korean corporation Hyundai "has no legal force of a commercial contract," Myung-Bak Lee, president of Hyundai Corporation, told TASS on Monday.

The corporation's president who is in charge of its foreign economic activity explained that document signed by the Russian Federation Deputy Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Valeriy Chichkanov and himself only states the two countries' readiness for close economic cooperation.

The president said that he had to make this explanation for the reason that a report published by the Soviet media said that the Russian Government and the Hyundai Corporation had signed a contract for the supply of South Korean consumer goods to Russia in return for crude oil Russia promised to South Korea.

Myung-Bak Lee said that in reality the sides had only expressed mutual interest in concluding this barter deal. "However, the document signed is not a contract since neither the goods, nor prices, nor volumes of deliveries have been agreed upon," Myung-Bak Lee said.

Besides that, as the corporation's president said, representatives of the Russian Government "have inaccurately informed the South Korean corporation as to their authority to conclude a treaty on the delivery of oil or other raw material resources." Confirming that it favours the development of ties with the Soviet Union, Hyundai Corporation believes that it should conclude all economic contracts in future with the foreign economic agencies of the Soviet Government, Myung-Bak Lee said.

"This does not mean that the corporation ends all contacts with the Russian Government," the corporation's president said. "Quite the contrary, the South Korean side is very much interested in mutually advantageous cooperation with Russia." But he said that the corporation would not like to discredit itself in the eyes of Soviet people who could have inferred from the previous reports that Hyundai had already undertaken to supply goods to Russia.

Kozyrev Discusses RSFSR's Foreign Priorities

PM0211164690 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 43, 4-11 Nov 90 p 13

[Interview with Andrey Kozyrev, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Foreign Minister, by Aleksandr Makhov; place and date not given: "Russia Appears on the Scene"]

[Text] Andrey Kozyrev, the 39-year-old international organizations department head of the USSR Foreign Ministry, received the portfolio of Russia's Minister of Foreign Affairs last week. We asked Kozyrev about the prospects for Russian diplomacy.

[Kozyrev] Now that the point is to return Russia from diplomatic non-existence, this republic could inspire more realistic international positions on the part of the USSR, upholding the specific requirements of citizens of Russia. Three concentric circles of Russia's interests can be traced and I regard the first two as vitally important. The first circle is the sovereign states making up the present Union. Whatever form it takes in future, the single economic and cultural space will be objectively preserved. Elements of distrust and violence must be removed from relations between various republics. The Foreign Ministry of Russia must deal in earnest with this issue.

The second circle consists of our neighbours in the northern hemisphere, above all Europe, North America, Japan, China and Korea. I believe that Russia should be represented independently of the USSR at the Helsinki process and could participate in the November Paris meeting.

Today Japan is the main stumbling-block for Russia's diplomacy. I would like the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] parliament to weigh once again all the pros and cons of relations with Japan. The territorial dispute must be resolved—and soon.

As for Russia-U.S. relations, here too we have to free ourselves, as soon as possible, from the idea of global competition. We must forget such notions as class adversary, aggressive power and so on. To my mind, it would be useful to think whether Russia needs an army on the scale of a superpower? Do we have to weigh on precision scales the balance of forces with those countries which are not our opponents today? What does reasonable sufficiency imply for Russia?

Finally, the third circle includes all the remaining states. Here we must discard, once and for all, the idea of struggling for spheres of military and political influence. With this group of states we must have, above all, mutually advantageous economic relations. Aid to developing countries will be rendered only after we have attained the level of highly advanced countries. As for military aid to such countries as Cuba, Libya and Syria, such aid reflects neither their interests nor ours.

Moscow To Rename Streets, Squares, Stations

LD0511122290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0900 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Text] The Moscow Soviet Commission on Culture, Art, and the Protection of Historic Heritage has adopted the first list of streets, squares, side streets, and subway stations that are due to have their names changed. The Ploshchad 50-Letiya Oktyabrya [50th Anniversary of October (Revolution) Square] will again be called Manezhnaya [Manage Square]; Ploshchad Sverdlova [Sverdlov Square] will become Teatralnaya Ploshchad [Theater Square]; and Ploshchad Dzerzhinskogo [Dzerzhinskiy Square] will become Lubyanka.

Kolkhoznaya Ploshchad [Kolkhoz Square] and Malaya Kolkhoznaya Ploshchad [Small Kolkhoz Square] will again become Sukharevskaya Ploshchad [Sukharev Square]; and Ploshchad Belorusskogo Vokzala [Belorussian Station Square] will again become Tverskaya Zastava [Iver Gate].

Twenty central streets and prospects will also have their names changed. Ten subway stations will also be renamed.

'Arms Workshop' Uncovered by KGB in Bryansk

LD0511180490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1600 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Text] Two citizens have been arrested in Bryansk as they attempted to send arms to Transcaucasia. In the course of a preliminary investigation carried out by KGB and Ministry of Internal Affairs employees, a well-equipped arms workshop has been discovered in a private house in the town. There, gun barrels found on the battlefields of the last war were restored. Metal working as well as chrome plating and parts finishing was done there.

Protest Fails To Halt Kemerovo CPSU Inventory*PM0511120190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 90 p 2***[SIBINFORM report: "Handing Over Property!"]**

[Text] By decision of a session of the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet, an inventory of CPSU property will be taken. It should determine the sources from which the property was acquired.

Kemerovo CPSU Obkom [oblast committee], having formally agreed to the inventory, made an appeal to the USSR Prosecutor's Office. A reply was soon received signed by V. Andreyev, USSR deputy general prosecutor, which concluded, citing articles in the Law on Ownership, that the oblast soviet decision was illegal.

However, the inventory of the Communist Party's property is continuing. In the opinion of deputies only the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet can forbid it to take place. An inventory of certain party publishing houses has already been taken.

Tver Oblast Mothballs Heavy Industry Projects*PM0211151990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 28 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1***[TASS report: "Construction Suspended"]**

[Text] Tver, 27 Oct—The Tver Oblast Soviet session which has ended here decided to suspend construction of large industrial enterprises in the Upper Volga region.

Projects of the car-building and machine tool-building plants, the "Khimvolokno" and "Rzhevbashkran" Associations, and many other production processes are to be mothballed. The capacities of contract organizations thus freed will be directed toward the needs of agriculture, the processing industry, and the social sphere and toward housing and municipal construction.

The deputies also approved a list of projects submitted by the oblast soviet executive committee whose construction is being deferred until 1996-2000. In all, construction workers will leave 42 heavy industry enterprises.

Udmurt Promotes Reform, Eliminates Gosplan*914A0045A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
20 Oct 90 Union Edition p 1*

Article by Alyans Sabirov, Izhevsk: "Gosplan Eliminated"]

[Text] State committees for economics and economic reform have been organized to replace the State Planning Committee and State Committee on Prices in Udmurt Republic.

The legislature voted down the old structure of government, and it did not agree to an increase in administrative expenditures by one million rubles. It was decided in principle that the reorganization will be conducted within the parameters of the existing official pay fund. The main task of the government is to stop the economic slump and to increase the output of commodities, especially at enterprises of the defense branches, that is of a Union subordination.

The Supreme Soviet adopted the Law on the Protection of the Economic Fundamentals of the State Sovereignty of Udmurtia. The property rights of other republics and foreign states, and also the equal protection of all forms of property are guaranteed. Acts of state, financial, and administrative organs—including superior organs—that contradict the economic interests of the republic are declared invalid. The exploitation of natural resources will be conducted by means of licensing and the establishment of quotas.

The legislature gave an "OK" to a radical restructuring of the agrarian sector: By a special decree, acts in force on land use have been abrogated, and all lands have been transferred to the jurisdiction of local soviets. By 1 November, they must form a fund of land resources (reserve lands) for individual peasants, cooperatives, and other associations. Plots of arable land are allocated for them without hindrance and without coordination with labor collectives and the administration. A fund is also being organized to assist farmers, cooperators, and leaseholders who are placed on an equal footing with collective and state farms, in particular in the acquisition of equipment and resources according to state prices.

Army Officer Elected Kamchatka Oblast Chairman*PM0211151390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 25 Oct 90 First Edition p 1*

[Report by Captain Second Class M. Lukazhin under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Officer To Head Oblast Soviet"]

[Text] Petropavlovsk-Kamchatka, 24 Oct—A change of power occurred at the third session of the Kamchatka Oblast Soviet held in the past few days. Captain First Class P. Premyak, a military security officer, has been elected the new chairman of the oblast soviet.

This happened after a group of deputies belonging to the "Democratic Kamchatka" bloc expressed a lack of confidence in the previous chairman P. Zinovyev, who had held the post since last April. Previously P. Premyak had chaired the oblast soviet credentials commission. In contested elections he received an overwhelming majority of votes.

The new chairman has been handed a difficult burden, especially at a time when the session is to adopt a concept for the oblast's transition to a market economy. There are problems here in abundance: Despite its unique natural potential, Kamchatka has a financial debt to the state year in, year out. The supermonopoly, in

which 80 percent of industrial output here comes from fishing, also has an adverse effect.

Petr Grigoryevich Premyak is an experienced lawyer. He believes that a solution to the crisis should be sought through the strengthening of organization, patient persuasion, and democratic principles in work.

The following fact is noteworthy. Captain First Class Premyak is the fourth officer-deputy to be appointed to a leading local soviet post in Kamchatka. This has also happened before in Petropavlovsk-Kamchka, at the large shipbuilders settlement of Primorskiy, and on the Komandorskiye Islands.

News Agency Begins Operation in Tatarstan

PM0511171190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Nov 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by Yu. Balashov: "TATARINFORM's Credo"]

[Text] The TATARINFORM news agency—whose founders are the republic State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade—and the Soviet-Finnish firm "Poynt" has started operating in the capital of Tatarstan. The main aim of the agency is the timely dissemination of objective information about Tataria. It intends to open bureaus in places with a high density of Tatar inhabitants and to prepare special pages for newspapers in other regions in the country.

Western Republics

Crisis Situation in the Gagauz Republic Continues

'Myths' Fueling Tension Cited

PM0511120990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by E. Kondratov: "Moldova: Dangerous Myths"]

[Text] Two USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops regiments commanded by Colonel General Yu. Shatalin have arrived in the cities of Komrat and Chadyr-Lunga, the settlement of Vulkanesht, and other areas with a dense Gagauz population where a state of emergency has been declared.

Speaking on local radio USSR People's Deputy L. Gorshkov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations Commission, said that the ongoing talks between the SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova [Moldavia] legislative delegation and the Gagauz provisional committee should help to find a way out of the situation that has developed and avoid the exacerbation of the interethnic conflict. Both sides above all have to stop their mutual recriminations and insistently seek ways of reducing the tension.

This is possible, especially since the situation is still stable and under complete control. Both Moldavians and the Gagauz population are striving to avoid a fratricidal clash and are prepared to take concrete steps to meet one another halfway.

Let us ask ourselves, why are the good people of Moldova prepared to fight one another even to the death? I believe they have been misled by myths.

The first myth concerns the very possibility of an independent Gagauz state's existence. Two towns, two rayon centers, three dozen villages located in an area of unstable cultivation owing to drought, no industry or local construction materials, and a highly acute water shortage. Those are the realities. Let us ask just two questions. How would such a state survive solely on its own budget? Further: How could one imagine the Republic of Moldova's tolerating the emergence of a state of this kind?

Another myth exciting people today is the myth of the Gagauz encroachment on Moldavian territory and the Moldavians' encroachment on lands the Gagauz have worked for almost 200 years. We will not see either if we look at this soberly. No one is or has been preparing to organize a redistribution of land. The Moldovan legislature—and it alone—should have responded to the Gagauz deputies' proclamation of an independent republic. Its reaction was, incidentally, in keeping with what happened: The legislature deemed the Komrat Congress' decisions to be illegal, introduced a state of emergency, and has now called on the internal troops to assist.

Nothing changed in the life of the Gagauz peasant either after the republic was proclaimed in Komrat or after it was deemed illegal in Kishinev. It seemed that he would continue to live with complete confidence in the fact that he would at any rate continue working the land his forebears worked....

But no! The Gagauz peasants are now tormented by the fear of ending up as social outcasts or refugees, or being deprived of their land, homes, or even their lives. I only saw sullen, scared faces during a recent visit to Chadyr-Lungskiy and Bessarabskiy Rayons. Militia Major Petr Shoshev told me that he had settled 30 women with small children in the Bulgarian village of Tvarditsa—they fled there under cover of night. I remember the embittered excavator driver digging ditches to block the roads—just to ensure that the "invaders" do not get through....

But did anyone intend to drive the industrious Gagauz away from these lands? No, that too is a myth. But it was no accident that it arose. Thousands and thousands of young Moldavians in paramilitary uniform have gathered near Gagauz villages and fields. Why? To frighten them? Hardly. The newspapers are saying that the Moldavians will not yield an inch of land to the Gagauz....

IZVESTIYA has already written about the impassioned appeal which writers, journalists, doctors, and orthodox women made to the Moldavian people. They urged young people to defend their native land and create volunteer detachments to march south. Did the humanitarians know what they were doing? It seems not. The noble summons to defend their native land with their lives was unfounded—Gagauz peasants were not preparing to seize anything. I am still not clear how the march's organizers proposed to defend Moldovan integrity. I understand how the legislature would do it. But what about young people? What kind of "peace mission" can there be with the elders to all intents and purposes goading them on to fight—and fight not members of the provisional Gagauz committee, nor the deputies who proclaimed the republics, but their own peers. Only their Gagauz peers.

Is the risk to which the instigators exposed so many young lives justified? What trouble they are causing the militiamen who are doing their utmost to prevent the guys from attacking Komrat. Thousands of disillusioned young lads are freezing in the fields for the umpteenth day now. For what?

It is interesting to ask how many of their sons did legislative deputies and leaders of the League of Orthodox Women send there, to the south? Who will then answer for the sons of others?

No, common sense is not respected today. Dangerous myths camouflaged by dazzling ideas are involving innocent people in conflicts and causing grave trouble. The march of thousands of workers from the Dnestr area armed with cudgels and iron bars to assist a "neighboring sovereign republic" was, after all, effectively just an excuse for a "punch-out," a manifestation of primitive barbarism under the slogan of "internationalism."

All the same, I do not want to level accusations at the young Moldavians, the Gagauz guys, or the Dnestr workers. At least their conscience is clear, their motives sincere, and their impulses noble. But it is not for nothing that we say that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. It is bad that speculation in political mythology involuntarily involves many thousands of credulous rather than thinking people in conflicts from which it will take them a generation to extricate themselves. I now understand the legislative deputies who could not bring themselves to take part in the roll call vote on the question of whether or not to leave the volunteers in the danger zone, particularly since it was to be reported in the press. After all, were something to happen, mothers would then also call them to account by name.

When will we finally realize all the same that human values—life, health, honesty, good deeds, and love—are the only thing not only worth living for but also worth dying for? Dostoyevskiy spoke of the tears of an

aggrieved child which nothing in the world can expiate. What about the life of a son, a brother, or a husband? Ask the women about that.

Moscow Reports on Situation

LD0511180190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1600 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Text] The whole country is anxiously following the development of the situation in Moldova. The republic's legislature is reviewing its position with regard to ethnic minorities, and is resolutely insisting on constructive dialogue with the Gagauz population and the Dnestr region.

On Sunday [4 November], the entire republic listened to a talk by Snegur, president of Moldova, who had returned from Moscow, on his meeting with Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, and other leaders of the country. Snegur gave a clear account of his position: Moldova should remain undivided; a moratorium should be imposed on all decisions of the legislature which infringe the interests of the population of the left bank of the Dnestr and (Stepnoy Budzhyak).

Khadyrke, first deputy chairman of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, also a participant in the Moscow meeting, was specific on the measures which have to be drawn from today's crisis. Foremost of these is to disband the volunteer units on both sides of the Dnestr; a review of the period of validity of the clauses on language; and the return to Gagauz deputies of their powers.

The Supreme Soviet has been hard at work all day. Deputies gave a harsh assessment of their colleagues who are gaining authority by exploiting national feelings. A difficult but important step has been made toward a general reconciliation. Long and probing, the session elected those making up the parliamentary conciliation commission, which will be headed by Deputy (Urchin-skiy).

Obstacles have been removed on the roads leading to (Budzhyak) and on the right-hand side of the bridge at Dubossary.

Moldavia, Gagauz Open Talks

LD0611110690 Moscow TASS in English 1053 GMT
6 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Fedor Angeliy]

[Text] Kishinev November 6 TASS—The Moldavian Parliament's Conciliation Commission led by Moldavian Communist Party leader Petr Luchinskiy met a Gagauz [Christian Turks] Conciliation Commission in the city of Komrat in southern Moldavia today.

On Monday night, Gagauz leaders informed the local parliament about the November 3 meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and Moldavian leaders.

The Gagauz Parliament formed a conciliation commission for talks with Moldavian authorities.

Coverage of Crisis Situation in Dnestr Republic

'Force' To Resolve Issues Continues

PM0511090590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 3 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent Colonel A. Yurkin: "Armed Formations Being Set Up"]

[Text] Kishinev, 2 Nov—A "Tiras-Tighina" battalion has been set up in Moldova [Moldavia] as a prototype national army. It is intended for operations on the left bank of the Dnestr. N. Kotorok, the new general chairman for military matters, has personally formed a "volunteer" detachment in Yalovenskiy Rayon, threatening parents that if their sons do not oppose the Gagauzes they will receive neither wood nor coal. The republic's military commissariat has started getting letters expressing alarm about the fate of children sent to Komrat.

Moldovan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Television has broadcast a speech by Yu. Roshka [as published], chairman of the Moldovan People's Front Executive Committee. He calls for the immediate secession of the republic from the USSR; the withdrawal of Soviet Army and Ministry of Internal Affairs troops from Moldovan territory; and the suspension of KGB organ activities, appeals to the UN Organization to send troops into the republic's territory, and calls for the establishment of a national guard. This is whipping up the situation even more. The people picketing units at the Kishinev Garrison now have a new slogan—"We will put down all the insubordinate in blood!"—to add to their usual slogan of "Down with the occupiers!"

The peacemaking mission of USSR People's Deputy Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev, who is in Moldova, is encountering vigorous opposition. Thus yesterday evening his car was stopped at a control point near Kishinev, even though he was going to meet with the pickets who were blockading one of the units and had been demanding that he come. The meeting was postponed until 3 November. While overflying the borders of the Gagauz Republic Major General A. Zaytsev discovered 10 parking lots of camouflaged buses with militia and armed volunteers. Attempts to use force to resolve political issues are continuing.

Thousands Attend Student Rally

LD0311135590 Moscow TASS in English 1248 GMT
3 Nov 90

[Report by MOLDOVA-PRESS—TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev November 3 TASS—The situation in the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic remains very serious. Clashes were reported between militiamen and

workers' detachments supporting the Dnestr Republic, which was declared as anti-constitutional by the Moldavian parliament, on the bridge across the Dnestr near the city of Dubossary.

The Moldavian Parliament continues to discuss the socio-political situation in the republic and measures to stabilize it.

A rally of Kishinev students, involving several thousands of people, was held in the central square of the Moldavian capital. They chanted slogans "Moldavia is in danger—let's defend it," "Let's defend the land of our ancestors" and "Moldavians, unite."

A resolution adopted at the rally supports forming Moldavian volunteer detachments and calls upon youths of the call-up age "to boycott the draft to the Soviet occupation Army and enlist in the Republican Guard to defend Moldavia's integrity."

Participants in the rally demanded Moldavia's cessation from the USSR.

Moldavian Women Begin Hunger Strike

LD0511131290 Moscow TASS in English 1239 GMT
5 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Fedor Angeli]

[Text] Kishinev November 5 TASS—Several dozen women went on a hunger strike in the city of Dubossary this morning to demand punishment for those responsible for last week's bloodshed.

Protesters blamed the Moldavian prime minister and interior minister for the tragedy.

Dubossary is situated in the predominantly Russian-speaking Dnestr region, which recently declared itself independent of Moldavia.

The Moldavian parliament declared the move unconstitutional.

Despite that, the Dnestr Republic went ahead with elections to its own legislature. The decision sent passions soaring and led to armed clashes in which several people were killed.

Defense Against Moldavians Urged

LD0611123890 Moscow TASS in English 1217 GMT
6 Nov 90

[Report by MOLDOVA-PRESS—TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golia and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev November 6 TASS—The situation remains tense on the Dnestr's Left Bank where a Dnestr Moldavian Republic was unconstitutionally proclaimed on September 2.

In defiance of the Moldavian parliament resolution, the so-called workers' self-defence detachments, which remain in control of the situation, have not been disbanded.

The Tiraspol city radio is conducting an active election campaign. In breach of the Moldavian parliament's decision, a moratorium on the November 25 elections to unconstitutional power bodies has not been set there and the nomination of candidates for election is continuing.

Speaking over the city radio, Igor Smirnov, chairman of the Provisional Supreme Council of the Dniester Republic, pointed out that "It is a question of only political and economic independence of the region".

He urged the residents of Tiraspol and other populated areas on the Dnester's Left Bank to defend the republic to the end and to prevent Moldavian Interior-Ministry troops from arriving in these areas under any circumstances.

"We must uphold our rights," Smirnov emphasised.

Kishinev's policy, he said, "is aimed at changing socialism itself as socio-political formation. Such policy should not be allowed to be pursued in the Dniester area".

Judging by Smirnov's broadcast remarks, the leaders of the Dniester Republic do not intend to set a moratorium on their previous decisions. This means that the conciliation commission set up by the Moldavian parliament is in for a large amount of complicated work.

Situation 'Remains Tense'

*LD0611122890 Moscow TASS in English 1213 GMT
6 Nov 90*

[Report by MOLDOVA-PRESS—TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev November 6 TASS—A trend for stabilisation has emerged in Moldavia over the past few days. Despite this, the situation remains tense in the Dniester left-bank area.

Lyudmila Skalnaya, chairman of the Republican Women's Council, issued an appeal to the Moldavian women. "We must do our best to end ethnic confrontation," she said.

"We women have lost three sons, and six children were left without fathers in nonsensical clashes in the area of Dubossary. We should learn this bitter lesson, heed the voice of reason and to prevent a new bloodshed.

"The conciliation commission set up by parliament has begun work. We should promote its successful operation to return Moldavia to a normal state."

Skalnaya called on women who went on hunger strike in Dubossary, to end this action, since it leads to further confrontation under the present conditions.

Valeriu Matey, chairman of the permanent Moldavian Supreme Soviet Commission on openness and the mass media, noted that the situation in the republic would normalise if parliament's decision on disbanding volunteer squads and workers' self-defence units was fulfilled in the Dniester left-bank area.

However, the leaders of the unconstitutional Dniester Republic are in no hurry to disband those detachments which have existed for a year at the expense of local enterprises.

"If these detachments are not disbanded in the near future, the efforts of the conciliation commission will fail," he stressed.

PRAVDA Reports on Moldavian Developments

*PM0211145990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2*

[Report by correspondent A. Pasechnik under the rubric "Confrontation": "Each Step is Hard. Concerning the Events in Moldova"]

[Text] Kishinev—A group of members of the Communist Party of Moldova [Moldavia] Central Committee, headed by P. Luchinskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the republic's Communist Party Central Committee, took the first flight to Moscow yesterday to meet with the country's President, M. Gorbachev.

The background to the flight is pretty unusual. A Communist Party of Moldova Central Committee plenum had begun the night before, discussing the social and political situation in the republic and the party organization's tasks arising out of it. After a brief but very worrying speech by P. Luchinskiy, the discussion began. The atmosphere was tense: The Central Committee building was picketed for several hours by a group of 100 to 150 citizens. Then a man who introduced himself as Ion Syrbu—acting for the people outside the building—entered the hall and made a brief speech. The gist of it was that the situation in the republic must be resolved immediately. For all its mistakes, people regard the Communist Party as the force that can positively influence the situation. "We demand," he said, "that you, the full Central Committee, fly to Moscow immediately and meet with the country's President M. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and achieve a peaceful settlement of the conflict in which the entire republic is involved and a resolute condemnation of separatism."

An unusual situation, indeed. To the Central Committee members' credit, they did not get on their high horse but discussed the proposal calmly and responsibly. Then a group was formed, comprising several people's deputies and Central Committee members, as well as two spokesmen for the initiators of the unorthodox proposal. The plenum broke off. The group took the first flight to Moscow.

Meanwhile, the storm clouds continue to hover over Moldova, although some promising gaps have appeared. I. Chubuk, deputy chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet Provisional Committee for the State of Emergency, announced that the previous 24 hours had by and large been calm. The withdrawal of Moldavian volunteers from areas bordering on Gagauz territories is practically complete and the Left Bank volunteers have gone home.

These steps are proving very difficult, though, I. Chubuk stressed. For instance, the legislature's decision to introduce a state of emergency in a number of population centers in the south has not yet been implemented. The Moldavian militia has not yet gone in. The committee put this down to the passive role of the country's internal forces introduced into the Gagauz territories. They in turn, according to statements made by the command authorities, are disinclined to perform functions that are not their own and to interfere in problems that can only be solved by legislative and political methods.

But here too it has to be said all the sides are looking hard for a way out. There are constant consultations taking place in Komrat and discussions of acceptable options.

The fifth session of the Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] of Moldova Supreme Soviet began in the morning. At the first sitting the legislators discussed the agenda, on which there are more than 50 items. The first—the social and political situation in the republic—will be discussed at a closed sitting, the session decided.

On Wednesday national television broadcast an appeal to the republic's legislature by the People's Front of Moldova executive committee. It puts forward the People's Front's main demands: the immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces from the territory of sovereign Moldova, the republic's secession from the USSR, and an appeal for help to the United Nations. How will the republic's legislature and public react?

Deputies Disagree Over Handling

PM0511085590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the general heading "Development of Situation in Moldova"]

[Text] Kishinev, 2 Nov—P.K. Luchinskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee, spoke today at a morning sitting of the Moldovan Legislature session. He briefed the legislators on the results of the meeting between the group of Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee members and USSR President M.S. Gorbachev which discussed the preservation of the republic's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

The day before, on his return from Moscow, the leader of the republic's Communists had given an interview to correspondents from the republic's radio service.

In particular he said that the discussion—in which A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, had taken part—had been very useful and timely. The Soviet leadership had obtained first-hand information. The USSR president clearly and definitely advocated Moldova's integrity and sovereignty, and opposed the actions of those who want to tear it to pieces.

The deputies then continued the discussion of the question "On the Sociopolitical Situation in the Republic." The legislators' opinions differed. Some, including Moldovan President M.I. Snegur, resolutely oppose the resolution of any interethnic, political, or other conflicts—including the Gagauz question—by strong-arm methods. Others, and there are many of them, are not opposed to whipping up feelings even further and are calling for forces to be used to resolve the situation prevailing in the south.

Speeches by certain deputies continued to feature calls for secession from the USSR, disbandment of the KGB on the republic's territory, and withdrawal of Soviet Army units from Moldova. In their speeches to Moldova's legislators, USSR People's Deputies Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev and Colonel General V.V. Osipov, commander in chief of the Southwestern Sector, rejected the claims that the Army is involved with the separatists' activities.

Deputies Criticize MVD Inaction

PM0511085990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent E. Kondratov: "Moldova: Army Getting 'Hostile Reception'"]

[Text] Kishinev—The heated debates at the Moldovan Supreme Soviet session discussing the question of the sociopolitical situation in the republic continued Friday morning. The same problems were discussed with USSR President M. Gorbachev Thursday evening by P. Luchinskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee, who had flown to Moscow. He briefed the session on the meeting.

Moldova considers itself to have been deceived by the Kremlin. The essence of the complaints is that the internal troops sent into the Budzhak region have not fulfilled their mission since they failed to enforce [obsepechit] the state of emergency. Under the law no mass meetings are allowed in the area covered by the state of emergency. But a deputies' congress of Gagauzes, and then a session, were held in Komrat in the presence of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs troops.

The Moldovan legislators' assessed the internal troops' failure to act as an outright indulgence of separatism.

The leadership of internal troop subunits believes that their mission—the prevention of bloodshed—is being carried out. The Army, the generals say, should not exercise functions that are alien to it or interfere in politics and interethnic relations. Marshal S. Akhromeyev and a USSR people's deputy from Moldova who spoke at the session considered the attacks on the Soviet Army to be unfounded.

Demands for the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Moldova can today be seen on pickets' banners.

Not everything is calm in Komrat. Many Gagauzes are opposed to talks in general. They picketed the premises where the Gagauz Conciliation Commission and members of the Moldovan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet interim committee are working.

Moldavia Orders Weapons Collection, Bans Groups

LD0511183190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1746 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev, 5 Nov (TASS)—The Moldovan [Moldavian] Supreme Soviet has condemned attempts to settle the interethnic conflicts arising in the republic through the use of force. This was declared by Viktor Pushkashu, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic, speaking on national radio today. He reported the republican legislature's decision to disband illegal volunteer and self-defense detachments and other unofficial formations within 24 hours, and to remove all recently established checkpoints and installations on roads and in populated areas of the republic.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Moldova' KGB have been instructed to supervise the voluntary surrender of weapons, and to confiscate weapons, explosives, pyrotechnic substances, and copying equipment from unofficial formations. The conciliation commission set up by legislature is to draw up proposals by 12 November for bringing the republic out of its crisis.

The Moldovan legislature appealed to the mass media to refrain from issuing publications which could fan unhealthy passions and exacerbate the situation. "People need to return to work since many of them have lately been distracted from their daily affairs," Viktor Pushkashu stressed.

Moldavian Militia Check for Kishinev Profiteers

LD0511225390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Interview with unidentified speakers by correspondent A. Barkhatov in Kishinev; date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—live or recorded]

[Text] [Barkhatov] It is probably interesting to know how Kishinev is living these days, these anxious days, late in the evening.

Tell me what is the meaning of your post here at the entry into the city?

[Unidentified man] Considering that the political situation here is very tense, some people are lining their pockets out of this. That is, they have contacts with warehouses and so on. They load coffee and pineapple juice which is in short supply in Moldavia. We have never seen it on the shelves of shops, and here there are such quantities. Here at the enterprise the lads—the volunteers—have arrived here to establish order. We have uncovered a great many violations of the law. There have been drunken people shouting various slogans and so on. So we are calling a halt to this and are establishing order.

[Barkhatov] Business at night is flourishing, but this car tourist—a citizen of Romania—was carrying five boxes of coffee, in short supply at home, as a gift he says. One has to presume from one set of good friends to others abroad.

The haul of the town militia over two days—there are hundreds of thousands of rubles' worth of confiscated goods, and that is in state prices.

[Man] Profiteering really is flourishing on an astounding scale. There are few staffers who are capable, that is are able to cope with this social evil.

[Barkhatov] That is, everyone is diverted to work in other regions?

[Man] Well, those volunteer units which were formed are here in Kishinev and demand that the authorities take urgent measures to combat crime. Our task is to direct this energy to ensure that there are no disorders in the town. We have such forces which are seeking [changes thought] destructive forces, seeking to sow disorder in the town. There are street fights, mass fights sometimes.

[Barkhatov] So for the present this is a very necessary format for the upsurge of energy which people have, and in general it has to be set to work [words indistinct].

[Man] It is possibly the only form in which to utilize this energy, the only one. People must not be used to resolve interethnic conflicts. It has to be used for combatting crime in the first instance.

Students To Blockade 7 Nov Kiev Military Parade

LD0611132590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 6 Nov 90

[Text] A representative of the Ukrainian Student's Union has reported that Kiev students intend to blockade the military parade in the Ukraine capital on 7 November.

Lvov Declares 7 Nov No Longer State Holiday

PM0511091990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Stepan Troyan: "Each His Own Holiday?"]

[Text] Lvov—The Lvov City Soviet Executive Committee has adopted the resolution "On Holidays and the Staging of Certain Events in Lvov City in November 1990."

The document considers yesterday's "red-letter days"—7 and 8 November—to be working days. This Wednesday and Thursday preschool institutions, schools, workshops, studios, canteens, cafes, stores, and so forth will work normally. At the same time, labor collective councils and enterprise leaders have been given the right to decide for themselves when they will observe holidays and when they will work.

On the Great October anniversary the participants in the traditional military parade will not march through the central streets but will take the relatively quiet Stryyskaya Street to the monument to the glory of the Soviet Army. By a decision of the oblast soviet 1 November has been declared Statehood Day: It was on that day in 1918 that the People's Republic of the Western Ukraine was proclaimed. Henceforth 7, 8, and 9 January; Christmas; and Easter will be holidays in the region. Everyone will have to make up the worktime accounted for by the main religious holidays by working Saturdays or other days.

Ukrainian Party Appeals on October Anniversary

91UN0142A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
14 Oct 90 p 1

["Declaration of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party 'On the 73d Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution'"—PRAVDA UKRAINY headline]

[Text] The Great October Socialist Revolution marked the beginning of a new era in the advance of world civilization, in the accomplishment of mankind's age-old striving to achieve social justice and humanism. The Great October and the ideas of V.I. Lenin opened up prospects for creating a new society. It was also a turning point in the history of the Ukrainian people who selected the socialist path for their development. It is thanks to the October Revolution that it became possible to assert Ukrainian socialist statehood, to liberate man from exploitation by man and from ethnic oppression. Therefore Communists and workers of the Ukraine traditionally mark 7 November as the birthday of Soviet power, the main revolutionary state holiday.

The selfless labor and martial feats of all generations of Ukrainians have been recorded for all time in the historic memory and social consciousness of the people.

Our achievements in socioeconomic and cultural development are also beyond question. Our history is both magnificent and tragic. Thus it was, and not a single page of it can yet be discarded. We condemn the crimes of Stalinism and the social deformations of the past, and we decisively dissociate ourselves from them.

The Ukrainian Communist Party is promoting radical democratic transformation in society, a national rebirth based on the Declaration on State Sovereignty of the Ukraine. It is striving for the triumph of universal human values, the creation of conditions for a free and dignified life to be lived by today's and coming generations.

At this critical and decisive moment, the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party is appealing to Communists and non-party members, and to representatives of various political parties and social organizations, to become imbued with a deep sense of personal responsibility for the destiny of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist State, for the future of our people.

We will greet the 73d anniversary of Great October with harmonious, well-coordinated labor directed towards stabilizing the economy, extricating ourselves from crisis, and improving the lives of people and the moral health of our society. Again we will reflect on the destiny of the Ukraine and her talented people. We will proclaim a resolute "no" to forces attempting to incite anticommunist, anti-Soviet hysteria; striving to sow seeds of dissension, enmity, and hatred; distracting people from the job at hand; and calling for strikes and civil disobedience.

In marking the anniversary of the October Revolution we are attesting to our civil dignity, patriotism, and internationalism, our steadfast trust in the humanistic potential of the socialist ideal which is absorbing the bright hopes and thoughts of the finest sons of humanity.

We invite to the festive processions, to the rallies and demonstrations, to the assemblies and other events of celebration, all who are striving to attain civil peace and accord, to achieve the constructive development of democratic processes and socialist transformations, and to effect a national cultural and spiritual rebirth of our sovereign Motherland.

We call upon Communists and all people of good will to mark the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution as a bright and triumphant holiday focused on the future, to commemorate it with renewed efforts and momentous achievements for the good of the people of the Ukraine.

[Signed] The Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party

Kravchuk Calls for Vote on Union Treaty

91UN0184A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
16 Oct 90 pp 1, 3

[Unattributed report on address by L.M. Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, to factory workers in Kiev on 12 October: "Meeting With Workers of the Kiev Factory 'Bolshevik'"]

[Text] On 12 October L.M. Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, visited the Kiev factory "Bolshevik" at the invitation of the labor collective. He visited the workshops, familiarized himself with production, and took an interest in the prospects for development of the enterprise. At the fourth assembly workshop there was a meeting with the workers and specialists of the factory.

Addressing himself to those present, L.M. Kravchuk said:

The economic situation in the country and in the republic is now the worst it has ever been during perestroika. There are both objective and subjective reasons for this. An objective reason is that the Ukraine—a sovereign state today—cannot make full use of the Declaration on State Sovereignty and the Law on Economic Independence that have been adopted. We are dependent on what happens in other republics: For example, we are dependent on prices of oil, gas, and cotton and on deliveries of these most important types of raw materials. To break existing ties would mean sending the economy of the Ukraine into an impasse.

Since the first days of the current session of the Supreme Soviet, we have aspired—not always in a qualified and thoughtful manner—to concern ourselves with the resolution of economic and social problems and to defend the interests of the Ukraine, its economy, and its domestic market. These aspirations are supported by the majority of people's deputies and by representatives of different political currents. This raises the hope that in the near future we will be able to adopt the laws and decrees necessary for this.

Taking the existing situation into consideration, the Supreme Soviet is focusing its efforts on defining its own ways of moving the republic to a market and on developing a new Ukrainian Constitution.

In our relations with other republics we are establishing horizontal ties which give us the opportunity of setting economic relations on a qualitatively new level and of reining in the lack of balance in the economy. We are ready to sign the appropriate agreements with many republics, and in the near future we will be doing this with Belorussia and the Russian Federation.

Concerning our position on the Union treaty, L.M. Kravchuk noted: I would like to call things by their proper name—the question is whether the Ukraine will be in the Soviet Union or secede from it. I believe that each of us and each person in the republic may have his

own point of view on the subject. But in my opinion, this is not a question that may be decided by the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Supreme Soviet, or any labor collective—even a very large one. Not even by the working class separately, or the peasantry, the youth, or the intelligentsia. It must be decided by all the people through a referendum.

Why is our life so troubled? Among the causes for the crisis the chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet named mistakes in the administration of the national economy, the absence of experience of working under the new conditions, the absence of the necessary qualifications in various sectors for making correct decisions, implementation of proposals that have not been thought through, haste, and impatience. The problems of the transition period, when existing Union and republic laws often contradict one another, should be taken into consideration.

The loss of control over monetary circulations has also had an effect on the growth of social tension. The population, although not all of the people to the same degree of course, now has twice as much money as there are goods and services. In addition, the quantity of money on hand is increasing and the volume of production of goods is decreasing. The already serious economic situation is complicated by the growth of crime and speculation.

As you know, the government has introduced its own proposals at the session with regard to stabilizing the situation in the republic. One of the most important proposals concerns the defense of the republic's internal market. That is to say, we should create conditions under which people residing in the Ukraine may purchase the most necessary items.

To provide for this, it is first necessary to increase the volume of production in all sectors of the national economy, especially of consumer goods. In this context it is also worth making far better and more efficient use of the opportunities of conversion.

In the second place, it is necessary to work out a price mechanism flexible enough to take into consideration the situation existing on the consumer market and still not worsen the already difficult position of the poorly paid categories of the population.

Finally, when all opportunities have been exhausted, we should not fear undertaking strict rationing of consumer goods through the introduction of coupons and trade using internal passports. As you know these measures are extreme, but there is no other way out. For if there is one unified currency in the country but the republics set different prices, some of them may grow poorer as a result and others will grow richer. A revealing example: The Russian Federation doubled purchase prices for meat.

Kravchuk's speech explained the position of a majority of deputies concerning the issue of the resignation of the

government of the republic and its chairman, and the speech expressed Kravchuk's attitude toward a new constitution which should be designed. It should be a constitution of a sovereign, independent Ukraine. And the entire people of the republic should give it a "thumbs up."

Issues connected with the students' hunger strike and their demands occupied a significant place at the meeting. Today not everyone, said L.M. Kravchuk, understands this outburst of the young students. The youth are emotional and they wish to claim their place and position in life not only morally but on the political plane as well. What methods did they choose? A hunger strike. Each person chooses his own way of doing things, and it is only necessary that he stay within the bounds of culture, tolerance, peace, argumentation, and discussion. Irritability and insult have no place here.

However, some believe that all problems may be resolved by just such an approach and that the hunger strike and the events surrounding it may force us to make some kind of immediate decision. As you know, one of the demands of the students is not to sign the Union treaty. It is their right to raise the question. But after all, the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has already declared that this issue will not be taken up before a constitution has been adopted.

I would like to repeat this over and over again. Neither the Supreme Soviet, nor the Presidium, nor anyone else besides the people themselves has either the legal or the human right to decide this question. Only the 52 million people of the Ukraine can speak their opinion by way of a referendum on this issue.

A Law on Referendums is presently being designed in the standing commissions of the Supreme Soviet. It will define the procedure for conducting such an important action. But time is needed for all of this.

As a result, anyone who is telling the students that the issue of a Union republic may be decided by the Ukrainian SSR and that it must be today, immediately, is simply being insincere, to put it mildly. If we are to call things by their true name, these people are inciting the youth to rash actions with unpredictable consequences.

The Law on Referendums will be adopted, and this question can be presented for a national vote. But again, much time is needed. So what should be done? Continue the hunger strike for an extended period?

I met twice with the students and twice I talked to them about it. They have had their say, and now there is no sense or need in endangering their lives.

We ourselves voted for democracy and pluralism, so let us live as civilized people. I also wish to say that if the legislature of any country were to work under the pressure of the street and of hunger strikes and do nothing but react to specific demands, it would not achieve anything worthwhile.

We approve of people's deputies who wish to genuinely work for the Ukraine and its people and who have taken a constructive position and tried to discover the road to positive changes, independent of their political orientation. My task as chairman of the Supreme Soviet consists of taking this situation into consideration and dealing with the realities of life. We must and should get out of the crisis as quickly as possible and then move forward one step at a time.

To be master on one's own land, to dispose of one's wealth—these are the demands of an overwhelming majority of the people. It will not be realized through slogans and loud words. The most important thing is our daily conscientious labor and the corresponding appreciation of that labor on the part of society. A person must be confident and socially protected: If he works well, then society will create the necessary conditions for normal life for him. We are also working on this in the Supreme Soviet.

At the end of the meeting L.M. Kravchuk answered the audience's questions.

Masol Resignation Reasoning Examined

91UN0196A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian 31 Oct 90 p 2

[Report on interviews with V.A. Masol, USSR and UkSSR People's Deputy; Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Chernyak, USSR People's Deputy and chief of a department of the Institute of Economics of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences; and O. Doniy, Kiev State University student representative, by Sergey Kiselev, special LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent for the Ukrainian SSR: "The Prime Minister Left, the Problems Remain—Three Express Interviews on the Resignation of the Chairman of the UkSSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text]

V.A. Masol, USSR and UkSSR [Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic] People's Deputy

[Kiselev] How do you assess your own resignation, and do you believe it is fair?

[Masol] I assess it as normal because it was impossible to work under the conditions that developed. For all practical purposes, a government was not formed until now; it has been in existence two months—can anything substantial be done in such a short period? I will say the following about the fairness of my resignation. I worked in the position of prime minister of the republic for three years. Not only the statistics but store shelves indicate that the economic situation in the Ukraine is significantly better than in the entire country. There has been no issue of money here, and in comparison with others we live rather prosperously. For the last nine months the national income in the republic rose, while at the same time it declined in Russia by two percent and across the

country by two and one-half percent. Nonetheless, the main attack of criticism was directed specifically against me.

[Kiselev] Did you try to talk with the students on a hunger strike in the square?

[Masol] No. I did not go to them.

[Kiselev] Did you consult with N.I. Ryzhkov or with L.M. Kravchuk regarding your resignation?

[Masol] I made the decision on resignation by myself, when I realized that the situation with the students' hunger strike was becoming unpredictable. Indeed, I was tired of being a "whipping boy" for no specific figures were cited in the criticism that was directed against me. Therefore, I decided to leave. Let the people learn, and let the legislature see who is who.

[Kiselev] Does your resignation mean that your entire cabinet will follow after you.

[Masol] No, it does not mean this. This is up to whoever is elected chairman of the UkSSR Council of Ministers.

[Kiselev] Do you know a person who would be able to lead the economy of the republic out of its neglect?

[Masol] First of all, I do not believe that the economy of the Ukraine is in neglect. I will cite the following figures in corroboration. Every person living on the territory of the UkSSR drinks one liter of milk daily, consumes 130 grams of sugar, 400 grams of bread, and 400 grams of potatoes. Well of course there are people who could successfully head the governmental organs of the republic, but I do not want to name them now because today this could evoke only a disruptive reaction.

[Kiselev] Your plans for the future?

[Masol] Honestly, I have not thought about them yet. Now I am on holiday. I turned in my papers and I released the working cabinet to the new boss. I am 62 years old and I hope that, with my experience, I will not remain without work.

[Kiselev] How much time did you spend on turning in your papers?

[Masol] I think about 10 minutes....

Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Chernyak, USSR People's Deputy, and Chief of a Department of the Institute of Economics of the UkSSR AN

[Kiselev] Who, in your opinion, forced V.A. Masol to resign—the students? The republic's legislature? The Ukrainian people?

[Chernyak] The concurrence of circumstances. I do not want to come out in the role of Masol's advocate, but I am confident that at the present time anyone who was in his place would be exposed to the same criticism. I doubt in general that a government could be found today that

in two months would be able to work quickly and radically change the situation for the better.

The sole thought in changing the prime minister is a change of his cabinet.

[Kiselev] As an economist, evaluate Masol's work in the post of chairman of the UkSSR Council of Ministers.

[Chernyak] I do not know everything about it. In the Ukraine, as in the other republics as a matter of fact, there was no government and there is no government: If 95 percent of the productive capacity of the republic belongs to the center, then what can the government do?! The main guilt of the prime minister and his government, in my opinion, is that it did not defend the sovereignty of the Ukraine before the center but in addition, for the sake of fairness, it should be noted that the blame here also lies with the Ukrainian legislature which did not provide a legal basis for this. Of course the government could have rebelled, but this would have been a rebellion on its knees. Incidentally, I think that the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, which agreed with the resignation of the prime minister whom it had appointed two months earlier, also thereby delivered a sentence on itself....

[Kiselev] Does this mean that the departure of the prime minister is senseless?

[Chernyak] No, I do not think so. The public saw its strength. Pardon the pun, but even if it was not necessary to remove Masol, it was necessary to remove him. In this case, he personified a system against which a fight was being waged.

[Kiselev] Let us assume: You, a well-known Ukrainian economist, are appointed chairman of the Council of Ministers of the republic. Time passes, the situation does not change, and the students once again declare a hunger strike....

[Chernyak] I would not let it get to a point where nothing happened. I have a concept, and I am convinced that if you are to work up a clear program of action and create a coalition government, then the process of a worsening of the economic situation in the republic can be stopped in a year and a half at a maximum.

[Kiselev] Did you talk with the student hunger strikers on the square?

[Chernyak] Of course.

O. Doniy, Student of the Fifth Course of the History Faculty of Kiev State University, Chairman of the Kiev Branch of the Ukrainian Student Union, and During the Strike Cochairman of the Coalition Council of Representatives of the Student Hunger Strikers

[Kiselev] Do you interpret V.A. Masol's resignation as a victory for the students?

[Doniy] Among the demands that the student hunger strikers made to the republic's legislature, the question of

Masol's resignation was the least important. It is necessary to change the composition of the UkSSR Supreme Soviet—it is only then that the government, headed by a new prime minister, will be able to function normally. As for Masol, this person, working directly for Shcherbitskiy who unquestioningly executed all Kremlin instructions and who ruined the Ukrainian economy, could not enjoy the trust of the people.

[Kiselev] The following situation today in the republic's legislature is completely realistic: The conservative majority, united in "Group 239," could place a person in the prime minister's chair who will be even less radical than his predecessor....

[Doniy] We understand this. But I do not doubt that the Ukrainian legislature also understands that in such a situation it will once again find itself under student pressure, and that such a confrontation cannot lead to anything good.

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Head on 'Crisis'

91UN0170A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
18 Oct 90 p 1

[Interview with I.S. Plyushch, first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, by PRAVDA UKRAINY legislative correspondent A. Sokol; place and date not given: "Why Does the Legislature Have a Fever?"]

[Text] The republic legislature periodically has a fever. The latest crisis has been caused by a student hunger strike and political demands. The crisis deepened on Tuesday to the point of deputies interrupting their proceedings for several hours. We talked with I.S. Plyushch, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

[Sokol] Ivan Stepanovich, a crowd of students is smoldering outside the windows of the legislature. Why do you think that it is precisely these people who are protesting?

[Plyushch] I have been thinking about this, and I have asked others to do the same....

If we analyze the history of this we see that the student reaction is objective. Young people respond to everything emotionally. But the main thing is that they are thinking not just about today but more about tomorrow. But unfortunately there are people who reason that there is no need to engage in perestroika! We lived without it. Yes, we did. But how?

As is known, the state is obliged first and foremost to defend the weak, that is the aged and children. But we are unable to do even that. Why? Because we have an unproductive method of production, and to change it is an extraordinarily complicated problem. It is a revolution for which, incidentally, they have voted in concert and called for radical economic reform. But when we said that privatization was necessary, then we heard the shouts: "That is capitalism!" I am by no means a

supporter of capitalism, but I am convinced that it is necessary to create a method of production that would insure a better life.

So with respect to the students on hunger strike they say with indignation: "Why do you not sweep away those tents?!" It is very unfortunate that such things are being said, and within the walls of the legislature. They have even accused the minister of internal affairs of inactivity—an obvious relapse into the dogmatism of the past, a desire for total dominance. But we have already "been through" all that—smothering it, sweeping it away, using force and so forth. Yes, the students can be driven into the auditorium. But what is the sense in that?

I would like to say to everyone—students, veterans, middle-aged people—that they should not replace one kind of violence with another, use one evil to drive out another. We must look for ways that are practiced in civilized countries.

[Sokol] But you are the first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Why not act to forestall negative phenomena? Personally, or with a group of like-minded people....

[Plyushch] I do not share your opinion that I am doing nothing. The work is not done only at the microphones that everyone sees. I report what has been said at meetings of the Supreme Soviet Presidium and in conversations with the deputies and the commission chairmen. But the complexity lies in the fact that the supporters of progressive, radical ideas are sometimes regarded almost as traitors. Some people think that I am one of them. But I do not trade in ideas. I share those that have been put forward by life itself. I think that there is enough violation of objective laws.

Now on the subject of forestalling undesirable events. If I could do it, I willingly would. As long as I knew the force required for it....

I am working in the direction about which I spoke, namely with these deputies and with those. But how they are driven is not something that depends on me alone. My ideas are not being grasped by everyone.

[Sokol] Do you think that there is a solution to the crisis that has befallen the legislature?

[Plyushch] There is no such thing as hopeless situations, particularly in the economy. A solution must be found. A mutual solution. Unfortunately neither the opposition nor the "For a Sovereign Soviet Ukraine" group has yet offered any constructive proposals. Moreover, their statements are often one sided.

I think that an effect is also being felt from the fact that we do not have our own Ukrainian program for resolving the situation. The government promises that the program will be ready in about two weeks. But today it is days and even hours that are important.

[Sokol] If everything depended on you, to what steps would you agree with respect to the demands of the students?

[Plyushch] Let me say unambiguously that military service should be voluntary outside the boundaries of the Ukraine. I believe that this is exactly the version that should be in the Supreme Soviet resolution.

With regard to the resignation of the government: Vitaliy Andreyevich Masol has not done all that he could have on this plane; he has grudgingly answered that no resignations have been requested and no ways have been found to extricate the republic from economic crisis, and he did not say what position he has assumed. (Yesterday it seemed that this problem had been resolved: The premier announced his resignation—A. Sokol.)

[Sokol] What is your attitude toward a Union treaty? What will the Union be?

[Plyushch] Today it is easy for me to answer that question: I explained some days ago that in its appeal to people of the Ukraine, the Supreme Soviet Presidium stated that it will work primarily to stabilize the economic situation; build a sovereign, law-governed Ukraine; and adopt a new republic constitution. Before these documents are adopted, talk of a Union treaty is premature. Now the session has voted on this. It can be confidently stated that there can be no talk of a Union treaty before adoption of a new constitution.

The kind of Union that it will be will be decided by the republic-states that make up that Union. Attempts by the center to impose its own model are a big mistake.

[Sokol] Ivan Stepanovich, what is your assessment of the call to dissolve legislature?

[Plyushch] It would be a dangerous step. I agree with what was said by Supreme Soviet Chairman L.M. Kravchuk: If there is no legislature, the Ukraine would be rudderless. For both objective and subjective reasons our government is also operating in a very cautious and passive manner.

[Sokol] There is one opinion that states that three forces are operating in this present session, namely the "Narodna Rada" group, the "For a Sovereign Soviet Ukraine" group, and the Supreme Soviet Presidium. What do you think about this?

[Plyushch] I would not say that. But I do think that there is a need for a third force. Such a force would serve as a unique kind of balance between the legislative majority and minority. It could be formed around the Supreme Soviet chairman, if of course he wants this. Leonid Makarovich says that he wants this, and I believe him.

[Sokol] I am ready to work in that direction. Regardless of political affiliation or affiliation with any particular legislative group, the deputies could create a nucleus that would try to do constructive work and have a creative

approach to today's problems and would take the existing reality into account.

[Sokol] Is it true that an opposition exists in the Supreme Soviet Presidium?

[Plyushch] There is an obvious opposition in the Supreme Soviet. Within the Presidium there are members who relate to the opposition. I think that they are useful people for the Presidium: Through their actions they are forcing greater in-depth work on the decisions that are reached.

[Sokol] Opposition forces are operating in the legislature without any clear-cut organizational structure. Does this not hamper the work of the session?

[Plyushch] The statement circulated to deputies on this subject—the "Democratic Platform"—and the statement at the session by People's Deputy V.F. Filenko have a kernel of rationality. It is necessary to work in this direction. But I am more impressed with a legislative structure of the kind I have talked about, namely a constructive nucleus of deputies, and this in terms of numbers so that it would be possible for it to operate productively.

Ukrainian Unity Demonstration Held in Bukovina

LD0511231790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2129 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent P. Savchak from Bukovina, Ukraine; from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] [Announcer] In the West Ukraine at present measures are being taken to demonstrate the unity of the Ukrainian people. Those who are supporting the full state independence of the republic are in a strong position in the region. In Bukovina an incident has just occurred devoted to the jubilee of the gathering decreeing that the oblast should be united with the Ukraine.

[Savchak] According to the preliminary plan of the representatives of the different parties making up the Ukraine's democratic bloc as well as Rukh, the Bukovina gathering was to take place in Theater Square in Chernovtsy. An original roll call similar to that which took place on this very site in November 1918 was to be held. But the democrats decided to dissociate themselves from the Communists and gathered outside Chernovtsy University. A human chain was formed here as a mark of unity of the Ukraine people, stretching for approximately 450 kilometers.

Minsk Protestors To Disrupt 7 Nov Parade

PM0511151390 Moscow TRUD in Russian
4 Nov 90 p 1

[Report by correspondents V. Bogdanov and A. Kryzhanovskiy: "Baby Carriages Versus Tanks?"]

[Text] A difficult situation is shaping up in Minsk over the military parade there on 7 November.

While more than 3,000 servicemen and almost 90 units of combat hardware are preparing for the ceremonial march past on the Belorussian capital's main square, the organizations prepared to obstruct it are making their presence felt increasingly loudly. The Minsk City workers committee has described as an irresponsible action the demonstration of military strength in Belorussia which has been declared a national disaster zone as a result of Chernobyl.

After discussing the question, the Belorussian Supreme Soviet Presidium came to the conclusion that there are no legitimate grounds for violating the USSR president's "holiday" decree. The city soviet executive committee has been instructed to take all measures to protect public order and citizens' safety during the procession by troops and combat hardware. By all accounts, that will not be so easy to do. The aforementioned workers committee has anticipated the "likelihood of social measures of influence" if its demands are ignored. The implication of that phrase is still not clear. The youth newspaper ZNAMYA YUNOSTI has carried a report on the intention of activists of the little-known women's league to block the soldiers' road with... baby carriages.

Caucasus

Armenian Businessman Views Economy

NC0611061790 Yerevan ARMENPRES International
Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Text] Yerevan, 2 Nov (ARMENPRES)—The basic guidelines for the stabilization of the national economy and for the introduction of market relations into the economy indicate that each sovereign republic has the right to formulate and implement measures by taking into account its own specific national and historical characteristics.

What possible avenues exist for the transition to market relations based on economic management, given the conditions in Armenia? ARMENPRES correspondent V. Manukyan put this question to Telman Ter-Petrosyan, chief director of "Razdanmekana" association [machine-building association in Armenian town of Razdan] and a member of the all-Union club of directors headed by academician Abel Aganbekyan. The correspondent's choice was no mere coincidence. Telman Ter-Petrosyan is one of those leaders of the country's enterprises who back in 1985 were proposing the introduction of market system, stressing that it was the only way to cure the Soviet economy. Here are his views:

"There is no other alternative to the market. Speaking frankly, we have simply delayed its introduction. In my view, Armenia's contribution to that important reform must come in stages. In my view, we have to start from the agro-industrial complex. Enlarged industries must be

given up and the land should be handed to the farmers as private property. They could cultivate the land far more reasonably and obtain high and stable produce by creating farms, lease enterprises, and family brigades.

However, the state should not totally move aside; rather, it should provide the farmers with small machinery and capabilities. An able, enterprising farmer should be able to enter into exchange agreements with the manufacturers. A new, principled approach is also required with regard to storing and processing the agricultural produce. During the meeting of the directors, academician Aganbekyan provided figures according to which nearly 35 percent of agricultural produce is lost or rots during transportation and storage. It would be appropriate to have refrigerated stores and small small processing plants on the sites. These could be set up by the proprietors at their own expense. The Republic's machine-building complex could be productively utilized in the agricultural sector. For example, we are getting ready to produce small tractors at 'Razdanmekana.'

"There could be a similar approach to animal husbandry. I am convinced that only in this manner could we solve the food problem in our Republic. In my view, the consumer services should be handed over to the cooperatives and individuals. In general, cooperatives act as a powerful lever in a market economy. Through them we could have new trade centers and small enterprises producing mass consumer goods.

"The local enterprises in the Republic are not large, and as a rule the collectives could buy them and become their owners. Here it is necessary initially to sell the products in Armenia by using local resources. It is possible to expand the traditional national crafts and increase the production of mass consumption goods.

"Private shops should be more boldly introduced in the trade sector. By creating small enterprises and a broad network of trading shops with different forms of ownership, we could saturate our Republic's market with mass consumption goods and foodstuffs.

"Probably the most difficult area in the process of marketization of the economy is heavy industry, specifically its machine-building branch. The fact is that more than 70 percent of that branch in Armenia is under Union jurisdiction. That means that so far they are owned by the state which for decades has robbed them of their profits and instructed them how to produce and where to sell. The Republic had no right to interfere in their operations. But since we have now declared that anything in Armenia belongs to her, our mutual relations should be based on a principally new foundation. It is obvious that at present it is impossible and inappropriate to sever relations with the center. But through Union enterprises we could establish broad contacts with the factories and enterprises of the other Union republics. At present, the basic factor should be legally equal business interaction.

"It is a known fact that the production capacities of the union enterprises in Armenia is 50 percent and the center is not concerned with raising them to full capacity. Therefore, using this equipment the necessary goods for Armenia should be produced in accordance with the discretion of the Armenian government.

"The joint ventures now being created with foreign enterprises could greatly contribute to Armenia's prosperity. This privilege [of permitting the formation of such ventures] should be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the local authorities.

"I am convinced that the Armenian Republic will secure substantial gains from the market economy. It has conducive preconditions, expertise in sound trade, and an industrious people."

KGB Breaks-Up Armenian Weapons-Smuggling Ring
LD0611083790 Moscow TASS in English 0831 GMT
6 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 6 TASS—The KGB and local police busted a weapons-smuggling ring in Bryansk region, seizing rifles, bombs and a large amount of gunpowder and ammunition, the KGB Information Service announced here today.

Members of the ring bought illegal weapons from residents in order to smuggle them to Armenia. They also planned to seize arms from a military facility in the region.

The incident is being investigated.

Armenian Commission To Study Amnesty Question
NC0611102290 Yerevan ARMENPRES International
Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 5 Nov 90

[Text] Yerevan, 5 Nov (ARMENPRES)—The Presidium of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet formed a commission on amnesty affairs. It will undertake a preliminary study of the policy document on amnesty for the convicted and will formulate relevant proposals in connection with pertinent issues.

Grachik Simonyan, people's deputy, director of the Socio-Political Research Institute, and a member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, was appointed chairman of the commission.

Armenia, Azerbaijan Prosecutors To Cooperate
PM0611114990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Interview with Armenian Prosecutor A. Gevorkyan by IZVESTIYA correspondent Sergey Bablunyan; place and date not given; under "Direct Line" rubric: "Prosecutors Pool Efforts"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Yerevan—IZVESTIYA has already reported that two prosecutors—Armenia's A. Gevorkyan and Azerbaijan's I. Gaibov—have had a meeting in Armenia's Idzhevskiy Rayon.

At the close of the talks your correspondent asked Armenian Prosecutor Artavazd Gevorkyan to answer a few questions.

[Bablunyan] What were the talks about and are there grounds for thinking that it proved possible to reach agreement on some questions?

[Gevorkyan] The agenda was dictated by interethnic conflicts. Hence the main subject of our discussion was how to prevent a further escalation of tension, put a stop to it, and channel mutual relations into a normal course. A very complex task, and we must obviously begin with the details. We examined one of these details in Idzhevskiy, and everything indicates that we reached agreement. I will explain what I am talking about.

As is well known, during the period of interethnic conflicts in the neighboring republic, Azerbaijan law-enforcement organs arrested Armenians who served sentences on Azerbaijan territory by decision of the court. They were subsequently extradited to Armenia.

I. Gaibov and I reached agreement for the validity of the judgments passed in these criminal cases to be reexamined on the basis of the Armenian prosecutor's petition. I hope that it has proved possible to reach a united opinion regarding the inadmissibility of using blockade of the gas pipeline as a means of pressure. In turn we promised to do everything necessary to ensure that there are no conflicts on the border with the neighboring republic. We agreed to direct telephone contact with one another with regard to every incident and to find means of resolving the problems that arise.

[Bablunyan] Has there been a reason for direct communications following the close of the talks?

[Gevorkyan] Yes there has, unfortunately—a sad one at that. A few days ago four shepherds were killed in Armenia's Gorissskiy Rayon and 800 head of cattle stolen. We have had talks with the Azerbaijan prosecutor. We will discuss this in more detail at our coming meeting.

[Bablunyan] When will it take place?

[Gevorkyan] Most likely after 7 November. We will set a final date for the meeting, to be held in Nakhichevan, in the next few days.

[Bablunyan] What else can be credited to the Idzhevskiy meeting?

[Gevorkyan] Proposals regarding joint measures to improve interethnic relations were largely approved. It has been decided to resume the work of the Armenian and Azerbaijan prosecutors' coordinating council. It is,

in particular, a question of investigating all crimes territorially connected with the two republics and offering mutual assistance in tracking down and consolidating evidence and arresting and handing over criminal.

Central Asia

Plantations Created To Rehabilitate Aral Sea

LD0511142590 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT
5 Nov 90

[Report by TASS Correspondent Vladimir Gandzh]

[Text] The Kazakh Academy of Sciences has set up a new botanical garden in the Aral ecological disaster zone, created by the rapid shrinking of the Aral Sea. The first heat, drought and salt resistant trees, bushes and grasses were planted there this autumn. Those that withstand the local conditions will be used to ameliorate the former sea bed.

This is being done to eliminate sand and salt storms originating on the dried up Aral sea bed. Specialists have estimated that each storm carries up to 75 million tonnes of sand, dusts and salt distances ranging from 400 to 500 kilometers. This causes much damage to major agricultural oases in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan.

The new academic botanical garden was set up in keeping with the special decision of the Soviet government to improve the ecological situation in the Aral Sea region. The document envisages the planting of various trees and bushes on an area of over one million hectares of desert land, which appeared in the dried up areas.

The feasibility of this difficult project is proved by the fact that large areas of the Aral sea bed are already covered by Sakshivujlan [as received] indigenous species found in Kazakh deserts. Saksaul seeds, it is believed, were blown there by winds from Saksaul forests in the Kazakh desert of Kyzyl-Kum and the Aral desert of Kara-Kum.

Kirghizia' Akayev Interviewed on Future Goals

PM0511142490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Nov 90 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Kirghiz President Askar Akayev by correspondent Yu. Razgulyayev; place and date not given: "Questions After the Battle"]

[Text] As has been reported, following a three-day legislative battle the 46-year-old scientist Askar Akayev has become the first president of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. The doctor of technical sciences and president of the republic Academy of Sciences beat candidates who included major party and soviet leaders. The new president answered a PRAVDA correspondent's questions.

[Razgulyayev] Were you surprised to be elected president?

[Akayev] Of course. I was not seeking power, after all. I was even intending to retire from the USSR Supreme Soviet in order to return to scientific work. But when the presidential election in Kirghizia was inconclusive and a "legislative crisis" developed, I accepted a proposal to run for election.

[Razgulyayev] No doubt your decision was connected with the complex situation the republic is in at the moment?

[Akayev] Naturally. The interethnic clashes in the summer in Osh Oblast and other parts of the republic severely exacerbated the situation. For some months Kirghizia has been beset by the aftermath of the assaults and the riots. People were only just beginning to regain their composure and were tentatively hoping that the situation would stabilize when there appeared the threat of a split, first in the Supreme Soviet and then inevitably between regions. Many deputies saw the nomination of a totally new person for the presidency as a real way of bringing the groups together and getting them to agree.

On the other hand I, for example, was very conscious that the path would be strewn with difficulties, and many difficulties there are already. You saw the pickets outside the republic Communist Party Central Committee building, the dozens of hunger-striking students, and the angry telegrams addressed to the session. It is not for the fun of it: the economy of Kirghizia, as in the country as a whole, is tumbling into the abyss of crisis. Prices are rising, shelves are empty....

[Razgulyayev] What do you intend to do first as President?

[Akayev] It would be a fundamental mistake to begin by dismantling and reorganizing. First we must take stock and hold a series of consultations with various social and political forces. The first meetings took place during the Supreme Soviet session. I talked with the regional associations of deputies and with the active group "For Democratic Renewal, For Civil Accord." They have different views of current realities, but I think it is this diversity of approaches that will facilitate our choice of the correct action strategy and tactics.

The treatment of the new social and political associations in the republic will change. Only yesterday many conflicts with young people arose because the relevant organs had not registered democratic movements and ethnic and cultural associations. At the session the deputies adopted a decision on the immediate elaboration of a mechanism for the "legalization" of all these associations.

[Razgulyayev] But what about the Kirghiz Communist Party?

[Akayev] I am sure that despite all the criticism and accusations, the Communist Party will retain its leading role. Party members not only constitute a majority in the new legislature but also set the tone in all of its groups,

committees, and commissions. There are conservatives among them, a conservative wing as was evident during the debate over draft laws. But conservatives are an essential ingredient, as it were....

[Razgulyayev] Soviet people are worried about the future of our Union....

[Akayev] As in other legislatures, the Kirghiz deputies spent the session working hard on a draft declaration on sovereignty. It has gone through on its first reading. We plan to finalize the declaration at the next session. But it is already apparent that the only future Kirghizia sees is that as part of a new, unified Union. We are firm on this. As for the rest—calm, prosperity, and a fitting life for our fellow citizens—it has to be fought for still.

Kirghizia Ratifies Law Allowing Media Independence

LD0611134290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1300 GMT 6 Nov 90

[Text] We have just received a report from Kirghizia. The Council of Ministers of the republic has adopted a decision essentially ratifying the law of the USSR on the press. The law did not exist before the elections of the president of Kirghizia. It has been ratified and now comes into force. The decision grants the opportunity to all the mass media to acquire independence and to open a bank account.

Tajikistan Decree Restricts Military Draft

91UM0079A Dushanbe KOMMUNIST
TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 9 Oct 90 p 1

["Decree of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet: On Certain Questions of Improving the Draft of Young People of the Tajik SSR Into the USSR Armed Forces"]

[Text] Thousands of young men of the Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] perform their military service in the USSR Armed Forces annually. They are represented in all branches and arms of the service. At the same time, however, owing to a number of circumstances of an objective nature, a substantial proportion of conscripts performs its constitutional duty in military construction and construction and engineering units of the USSR Defense Ministry and ministries and departments of Union significance.

The difficult socioeconomic situation in which our society finds itself and the exacerbation of interethnic relations in the country have led to a complication of the crime-inducing situation, including in the Soviet Army. Negative phenomena in the Army milieu and the current nonregulation relations between servicemen are directly influencing the level of their operational training and causing concern among the community of the republic and near ones and dear ones.

For the purpose of the further assurance of the guarantees of compliance with the rights and liberties of citizens of the Tajik SSR drafted for active military service,

and the defense of the interests of their parents and families, and also an improvement in the draft and the performance of their military service by the youth of the republic, the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. That young men of the Tajik SSR will be drafted into military construction and construction and engineering units as of the 1990 fall draft within the Turkestan Military District, chiefly in the Tajik SSR.

That the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers will prior to 1 December 1990 prepare proposals pertaining to the organization in the Tajik SSR of alternative service and the procedure of its performance by young men who in accordance with their state of health are not suitable for service in line military units.

2. To cease the draft for active military service of conscripts whose brothers have died in the performance of their duties in peace time in the ranks of the Soviet Army and also in performance of their international duty in the Republic of Afghanistan.

That the rayon and city draft commissions:

grant deferments for young men being trained in secondary specialized educational institutions and vocational-technical schools of a construction-engineering profile for the period of the study and for one year following graduation from the educational institution provided that they work in the specialty they have acquired;

send conscripts with families to perform their military service in units and subunits stationed on the territory of the Turkestan Military District, chiefly in the Tajik SSR;

grant younger brothers deferments until older brothers have completed their service.

3. To establish supplementary benefits for compulsory service personnel who have become invalids as a consequence of disabling injury and also for families of servicemen who have died in the performance of their duties.

That the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers draw up prior to 1 December 1990 the procedure and conditions of the allocation of the supplementary benefits.

4. That the oblast, city, and rayon soviets of people's deputies and enterprises, establishments, and organizations step up sponsorship of military units in which young men drafted from the Tajik SSR are serving and provide for the allocation of monies for the organization of trips to the Army subunits by representatives of the community, veterans of war and labor, and figures of culture and art and the amateur arts, and the dispatch of books, periodicals, and motion pictures illustrating the life of the republic.

5. That the military commissar of the Tajik SSR adopt measures to strengthen the local military commissariats

with personnel who know Tajik and the other languages of the majority population living in a given locality.

6. That the Tajik SSR Military Commissariat and Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation and Citizens' Rights and Appeals draw up draft regulations governing the military commissariat of the Tajik SSR and submit them for consideration by the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet.

7. That the Tajik SSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting pay particular attention to the elaboration of military-patriotic problems in radio and television programs and extensive coverage of the status and problems of the performance of their military service by young men of the Tajik SSR.

[Signed] K. Makhkamov, chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet.

[Dated] 5 October 1990, Dushanbe.

Uzbek-Belorussian Cooperation Agreement Signed

*LD0511115590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1000 GMT 5 Nov 90*

[Text] An agreement on economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation between the governments of Uzbekistan and Belorussia has been signed in Tashkent. The sides consider that the creation of genuine market relations is realizable first and foremost within the framework of direct links between enterprises, the agreement states.